8229

AN EXAMINATION OF Dr. CLARKE's *Scripture-Doctrine of the* TRINITY,

With a Confutation of it:

Inserted in an

EXPOSITION OF

Some of the most difficult Places of the *NEW TESTAMENT*, by Way of PARAPHRASE and ANNOTATIONS:

WHEREIN THE

Ninth Chapter to the *Romans* is set in a clear Light.

By VALENTINE HAYWOOD, M. A. formerly Fellow of St. *John Baptist*'s College in *Oxford*, and now Rector of *Bodham* near *Holt* in *Norfolk*, and Lecturer of St. *Matthew*'s *Friday-street*, *London*.

LONDON,
Printed for A. BETTESWORTH at the *Red Lyon* in *Paternoster-Row*, and C. RIVINGTON at the *Bible* and *Crown* in St. *Paul*'s Church-Yard. 1719.
(Price Two Shillings.)

BRITISH MUSEUM

To the Most Reverend Father in God, William, *by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of* Canterbury, *Primate and Metropolitan of all* England.

May it please Your Grace,

TO accept this short *Exposition,* that is intended at once as a *Comment* upon the *New-Testament,* so far as it goes,

and a *Preſervative* againſt *Arianiſm.*

The Neceſſity of appearing in the Defence of the Doctrine of the Holy, Undivided, and Ever-bleſſed Trinity is ſufficiently evident, becauſe *a late Writer* has not only ſtaggered the Faith, and unſettled the Minds of ſeveral unwary Perſons, who are ſoon apt to be ſhaken, and to *fall from their own Stedfaſtneſs*; but he has likewiſe leſſen'd the Opinion that we all ought to have of the Dignity and Divinity, and conſequently the Reverence and Eſteem that is juſtly due to

thoſe

those Two Persons of the Tri-une Deity, the Son and Holy Spirit, who are equally the Objects of our Adoration and Faith in Joint-union with the Father. And *Your Grace*'s Condescension and Affability to all inferior Persons, has embolden'd me to the Presumption of imploring *Your Grace*'s Patronage and Protection to these Papers.

And that *Your Grace* may continue many Years a bright Ornament to the Church of *England* for exemplary Piety, sound Learning, discreet Zele, Orthodoxy of Opinion, and universal

versal Charity, (which are Qualities that add a Luſtre to the *Mitre* that You wear) is the hearty Deſire and Prayer of,

My LORD,

Your Grace's moſt

Obedient, moſt Humble,

4 OC 58

and oblig'd Servant,

VALENTINE HAYWOOD.

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

THere having been several Comments upon the New Testament, that have gone through the whole, I have only selected some of the most difficult Places of it, and given an Exposition of them; upon the Perusal of which, if the judicious Reader should

ſhould meet with any Thing that may ſeem New and Strange, in any Paraphraſe *or* Annotation, *or if he ſhould happen to think that any of the Arguments there made Uſe of are not very common, it is to be hoped, upon ſecond Thoughts, that the Former may be never the leſs* True *for being* Strange, *nor the Latter ever the leſs concluſive for not being over common.*

'Tis true, indeed, the Imputation of Singularity, and eſpecially in Divinity, is what ought ſtudiouſly and induſtriouſly to be avoided: But where there ſeems to be an abſolute Neceſſity for differing in Opinion from other Authors, there the mere Neceſſity for ſo doing, will, no doubt, be a ſufficient Apology for it.

The very Name of a Free-Thinker, *according to the modern Acceptation of the Word, is what is juſtly odious in it ſelf, tho' it be too much in Vogue in this degenerate Age; nevertheleſs, ſuch a Freedom of Thought as endeavours ſincerely, without any corrupt Views, to*

ſet

ſet the Truth in its cleareſt Light, that maintains a due Reſpect for Antiquity, and a Veneration for the ſacred Scriptures, ſuch Free-thinking *as this, is what all the World will not only readily allow, but earneſtly contend for.*

The Liberty that I have here taken in the following Expoſition, *is (as far as I have endeavour'd) entirely agreeable to this Rule; where, if I have ſaid any Thing that ſhould contradict the Senſe and Judgment of the Catholick Church of Chriſt in general, or that pure and Apoſtolical Branch of it, the Church of* England *in particular, I ſhall be very willing, upon the firſt Conviction, to retract the ſame: And in the mean Time, what is here only offer'd with Submiſſion and Humility, will, I hope, have a very favourable Conſtruction put upon it, and be receiv'd with Candor.*

If any one ſhould be inclinable to think that I have writ with ſome Kind of Bitterneſs and Severity againſt a modern Arian, *(as I think he may be call'd)*

who may very justly be admir'd indeed for his great Learning, but not for his heterodox Opinions, the Answer that I have to make in my own Vindication is, That I am not conscious to my self of any personal Ill-will that I bear towards him, nor of any more Zele and Warmth, than what a just Concern for the Honour of my Lord and Saviour, and of the Holy and Ever-blessed Trinity may be suppos'd to inspire me withal; for if ever there was a Time, when we ought earnestly to contend for the Faith which was once deliver'd unto the Saints, NOW *is that Time*; NOW, *when the Articles of our most holy Faith are so openly and daringly attack'd, even by those that would be thought to be true Christians and Protestants, as well as by profess'd Infidels*; NOW, *since that Book of his,* The Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, *has done so much Mischief in the World, that if the Author was to retract his Errors, I question whether he would ever be able to make Reparation for the Injury done to the common Faith.*

I have

I have endeavour'd likewiſe in ſome Meaſure (tho' with all poſſible Brevity) to clear up the Notions of Election *and* Juſtification, *which if any one ſhould diſapprove or differ from me in thoſe Points, I hope however, I ſhan't be deem'd as a* Reprobate *for the one, nor* condemn'd *too ſeverely for the other.*

In fine, I would take Occaſion to acquaint the World, that all that Part that relates to Dr. Clarke, *which begins at the firſt Chapter of St.* John *and the firſt Verſe, was finiſh'd within two or three Pages, before the firſt Publication of Dr.* Waterland's *late Book; ſo that if that learned and ingenious Author has the Advantage in coming out before me, yet ſtill his Method is entirely different from mine: And I do very heartily join with all his Friends in returning him abundance of Thanks for his very excellent Performance.*

ERRATA.

PAGE 47. Line 12. after the Word *Text*, read *you may ſay*. p. 48. l. 16. for *mount* read *amount*. p. 60. l. 25. for *Terms conjointly* read *Perſons conjointly*. p. 101. l. 4. for *hadſt* read *haſt*.

4 OC 58

AN

EXPOSITION

Of Some of

The moſt difficult Places

IN THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

MATTHEW, *Chap.* V. *v.* 22.

——— *But whoſoever ſhall ſay, Thou Fool, ſhall be in Danger of Hell Fire.*

PARAPHRASE.

WHOSOEVER ſhall give reviling and opprobrious Language in his Anger, that reflects upon a Man's Underſtanding, with Bitterneſs and Contempt, ſhall be in Danger of being puniſh'd in the next

World, with ſuch a Degree of Miſery, or of Torture, as anſwers to that ſevere Puniſhment amongſt the *Jews*, of being burnt alive in this.

ANNOTATION.

The three-fold Gradation of Puniſhment threaten'd in this Verſe, that anſwers to three diſtinct Penalties amongſt the *Jews*, is very remarkable, both for the Manner, or Kind, and Severity of each of 'em; the moſt dreadful of all which, was that of being burnt alive in the *Valley of Hinnom*; which is the Reaſon of my putting that Senſe into the *Paraphraſe*, "of being puniſh'd in the next "World, with ſuch a Degree of Miſery, "or Torture, that anſwers to that ſe-"vere Puniſhment amongſt the *Jews*, of "being burnt alive in this."

And yet even this (as terrible as it is) is only to be underſtood *ex Hypotheſi*, upon the Suppoſition that we don't repent of ſaying to our Brother, *thou Fool*, that is, of giving reviling and opprobrious Language in our Anger, we ſhall incur the Danger of ſuch a Puniſhment; the Reaſon of the Demerit of which Sin being apparent from hence, becauſe a Reflection upon a Man's Senſe, or upon his Underſtanding, and eſpecially when it is ſpoken with ſome Kind of Acri-

Acrimony, Contempt, or Diſdain, is reckoned a much greater and more provoking an Affront than any other Reproach or Contumely of what Kind ſoever; witneſs the Reſentments of thoſe that are the moſt Ingenious and the moſt Senſible.

Matthew, *Chap.* V. *v.* 34.

But I ſay unto you, Swear not at all.

PARAPHRASE.

But I ſay unto you, Swear not upon all Occaſions.

ANNOTATION.

That this ought to be the rendering, and is the true Senſe of theſe Words, is evident.

1*ſt.* From the Signification of the Word ὅλως in the Original, *omnino*, *altogether*, that is, upon all Occaſions.

2*dly.* From the main Scope and Deſign of the Prohibition it ſelf, which, it is plain from the Context, was not meant with relation to ſuch Oaths as were taken in a ſerious and ſolemn Manner, with ſome Awe and Reverence of the Deity, but only ſuch as were made Uſe of upon every light and trifling Occaſion in a very irreverent Manner: The

Reaſon of which (as a very eminent Prelate † obſerves) was this; "The "*Jews* thought it unlawful, in ordinary "Communication, to ſwear expreſly by "the Name of God, but lawful to ſwear "by the Creatures, as by Heaven and "Earth, *&c.* —— So that our Saviour's "Meaning is, as if he had ſaid, You "think you may ſwear in common Con-"verſation, provided you do not ſwear "by the Name of God; but I ſay un-"to you, let your Communication be "without Oaths of any Kind; you ſhall "not ſo much as ſwear by Heaven or "by Earth, becauſe God is virtually in-"voked in every Oath. And unleſs we "ſuppoſe this to be our Saviour's Mean-"ing, I do not ſee what good Reaſon "can be given, why our Saviour ſhould "only forbid them to ſwear by the "Creatures, and not much rather by "the Name of God; ſuch Oaths being "ſurely of all others moſt to be avoid-"ed, as being the moſt direct Abuſe "and Profanation of the Name of God." Which, ſince he does not mention, 'tis therefore, I think, very clear, that the Prohibition is not to be extended to ſuch Oaths as are both ſerious and ſacred, but

† *See Biſhop* Tillotſon's *Sermon of the Lawfulneſs and Obligation of Oaths.*

but only ſuch as are heedleſs and profane.

Matthew, *Chap.* VII. *v.* 14.

Becauſe ſtrait is the Gate and narrow is the Way that leadeth unto Life, and few there be that find it.

PARAPHRASE.

Few there be in Compariſon of, or in Oppoſition to, the many that go in the broad Way that leadeth to Deſtruction.

ANNOTATION.

That this is to be underſtood only Comparatively, and not Abſolutely, is evident from two particular Paſſages of the New Teſtament, where the quite contrary ſeems to be aſſerted. The firſt is in the 8th of St. *Matthew* and the 11th Verſe, *And I ſay unto you, that many ſhall come from the Eaſt and Weſt, and ſhall ſit down with* Abraham, *and* Iſaac, *and* Jacob *in the Kingdom of Heaven.* The other is in the 7th of the *Revelations* and the 9th Verſe, *After this I beheld, and lo, a great Multitude, which no Man could number, of all Nations, and Kindreds, and People, and Tongues, ſtood before the Throne, and before the Lamb, cloathed with white Robes, and Palms in their Hands.*

From

From whence it is both eaſy and obvious to infer, that if *Many* ſhall ſit down with the three forementioned Patriarchs in the Kingdom of Heaven, if there will be an innumerable *Multitude of all Nations, and Kindreds, and People, and Tongues, ſtanding before the Throne*, &c. and one Part of the Scripture cannot be contradictory to another, then it is plain that when it is ſaid, *Few there be that find it*, this is only to be underſtood by Way of Compariſon, or in Oppoſition to the *Many* that go into a contrary State of Perdition.

Matthew, *Chap.* VIII. *v.* 22.

But Jeſus ſaid unto him, follow me, and let the Dead bury their Dead.

Paraphrase.

Let earthly-minded Men, that are dead in Treſpaſſes and Sins, bury their Dead.

Annotation.

There is a Spiritual or Moral, as well as a Natural Death; the Spiritual or Moral Death is what is deſcribed by the Apoſtle, *Epheſ.* ii. 1. *And you hath he quickened, who were dead in Treſpaſſes and Sins.* Coloſ. ii. 13. *And you being dead*

in

in your Sins—— *hath he quickened together with him*, &c. —— And they that are ſo immerſed or involved in Cares and Buſineſs of this Life, as either wholly to neglect Religion, or *ſeeking the Kingdom of God and his Righteouſneſs* in the firſt Place, according to our Saviour's own expreſs Injunction, ſuch Perſons may likewiſe very properly be ſaid to be dead in a ſpiritual Senſe, as well as they that are guilty of the groſſeſt Sins and Vices, becauſe (as the Apoſtle expreſſes it) *they are alienated from the Life of God*, Epheſ. iv. 18.

Beſides, it was an Obſervation ſuggeſted of Old from the mere Light of Nature, That this Life, merely as ſuch, ought to be termed Death rather than Life; for thus ſaith the Poet *Euripides*,

Τὶς οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μέν ἔϛι κατθανεῖν,
Τὸ κατθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν ;

Who knows whether to Live be not to Die,
And to Die, to Live?

Then again, (ſays *Cicero*, that great Maſter of Reaſon and Eloquence *) *Imò verò ii vivunt, qui ex corporum vinculis tanquam è carcere evolaverunt; veſtra verò quæ dicitur vita, mors eſt:* "They truly "live, who have made their Eſcape out "of

* *Somnium Scipionis.*

" of the Priſons of theſe Bodies, but that " which is called your Life, is Death " rather than Life."

So that the obvious Senſe of thoſe Words, *Let the Dead bury their Dead*, is, Let thoſe that are Dead in a Spiritual and Moral Senſe, let them bury their Dead.

Matthew, *Chap.* X. *v.* 34.

Think not that I am come to ſend Peace on Earth, I came not to ſend Peace but a Sword.

Paraphrase.

My coming into the World will be the Occaſion of great Diviſions and Perſecutions throughout the World.

Annotation.

This is not to be underſtood as if it was our Saviour's Intention and Deſign to cauſe Diviſions and Perſecutions throughout the World, but only of the accidental Event or Effect of his coming, through the Malice and Perverſeneſs of Men, who, out of Oppoſition to him and his Goſpel, he plainly foreſaw would certainly perſecute thoſe that profeſſed the ſame, and put them to Death.

And

And the Reaſon why I interpret *Sword* in the Paraphraſe by *Diviſions*, is from that parallel Place in St. *Luke*'s Goſpel, (*chap.* xii. *v.* 51.) *Suppoſe ye that I am come to give Peace on Earth; I tell you, Nay, but rather Diviſion.*

Matthew, *Chap.* X. *v.* 35.

For I am come to ſet a Man at Variance againſt his Father, and the Daughter againſt her Mother, and the Daughter-in-Law againſt her Mother-in-Law.

PARAPHRASE.

By my coming into the World (one main End and Deſign of which was to promote Love and Unity amongſt Mankind) they will take Occaſion to differ one with another upon the Account of the Chriſtian Faith; the Father, perhaps, embracing and profeſſing the ſame, and the Son at the ſame Time, either oppoſing and perſecuting, or being at Variance with him for that; or, *vice verſâ*, the Son may be a Chriſtian, and the Father oppoſe and perſecute him upon that Account, and ſo the Daughters in like Manner againſt the Mothers.

Or elſe,

Another Senſe of thoſe Words may be, that we muſt, upon Occaſion, forſake, and (comparatively ſpeaking) we muſt even hate Father and Mother, Wife and Children, Brethren and Siſters, and ſo be, as it were, at Variance with them, only upon this Account, whenever the Love of theſe ſtands in Competition with the Love of Chriſt.

ANNOTATION.

That the Words ſo largely paraphras'd upon are capable of theſe two Interpretations, is evident for the two following Reaſons:

I. Becauſe the coming of our bleſſed Saviour could be no other Way the Occaſion of near Relations differing one with the other, but only upon the account of the Chriſtian Faith; one embracing and profeſſing the ſame, and another either oppoſing or perſecuting him for it, as is too common amongſt Chriſtians now, who tho' they ſeem all to profeſs the ſame Faith, yet how do they oppoſe and are ready to perſecute one another for Differences in Opinion?

2dly, Becauſe the Ground of that other Interpretation is taken not only from the 37th Verſe of this Chapter,

where it is ſaid, *He that loveth Father or Mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth Son or Daughter more than me, is not worthy of me*; but from the 14th of St. *Luke*'s Goſpel, and the 26th Verſe, where it is likewiſe ſaid, *If any Man come to me, and Hate not his Father and Mother, and Wife and Children, and Brethren and Siſters, yea, and his own Life alſo, he cannot be my Diſciple.* The plain and obvious Senſe of which Words is, that we muſt only comparatively hate our Relations, and ſo, as it were, be at Variance with 'em upon this Account, whenever the Love of any of 'em ſtands in Competition with the Love of *Chriſt Jeſus*, who ought to be nearer and dearer to us than the whole World beſides.

Matthew, *Chap.* XII. *v.* 32.

And whoſoever ſpeaketh a Word againſt the Son of Man, it ſhall be forgiven him; but whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this World, neither in the World to come. —— ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι, οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

PARAPHRASE.

—— But whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this Age of the *Jewiſh* Diſpenſation, nor in that Age of the *Meſſias*, which you deluded *Jews* vainly expect to come.

ANNOTATION.

One Interpretation of ὁ μέλλων αἰὼν (which in our Tranſlation is render'd the World to come) in ſeveral Places of the New Teſtament, is the Age of the *Meſſias*, which to the unbelieving *Jews*, when theſe Words were ſpoken was (as they thought) to come: For according to a known Tradition amongſt the *Jews*, the Duration of the World was divided into three αἰῶνες, or Ages; the Age before the Law, the Age under the Law, and the Age of the *Meſſias*; which laſt Age they look'd upon to be the moſt glorious of all the Ages, and therefore in their Writings they frequently ſtyl'd it *Seculum futurum*, or ὁ μέλλων αἰὼν, The Age, or World to come.

Hence it is (as a very eminent Writer * obſerves) "That the Author to the *Hebrews*

* *See Bp.* Tillotſon's *Poſthumous Sermon upon* Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20. *Vol.* V. *pag.* 285, 296.

" *Hebrews* calls the State of the Goſpel " by this Name, as beſt known to them, " *Chap.* ii. *v.* 5. For unto the Angels " hath he not put in Subjection the " World to come, whereof we ſpeak; " that is, the Law was given by the Diſ- " poſition of Angels, but the Diſpen- " ſation of the Goſpel (which is call'd " the World to come) was manag'd and " adminiſter'd by the Son of God." Where if it ſhould be objected, that the Words in the Original are οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, and not αἰῶνα τὸν μέλλοντα, yet ſince 'tis plain and evident, that οἰκουμένη here is the ſame with αἰὼν, one importing, indeed, more properly the Duration, the other the Place it ſelf; (And it is ſaid expreſsly, *Heb.* i. 2. δι' ὃν καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν, *by whom alſo he made the Worlds*, beſides *Heb.* xi. 3. *Galat.* i. 4.) there need be no manner of Conteſt about the Difference of the Signification of either, and conſequently no Room for any ſuch Objection.

" So likewiſe, *Heb.* vi. 5. thoſe mira- " culous Powers which accompanied the " preaching of the Goſpel, are call'd " δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, *the Powers of* " *the World to come*; that is, of the " Goſpel Age, or Age of the *Meſſias*."

And accordingly it ought to be obſerved, that the *Septuagint*, in their Tran-

Tranſlation of that Verſe, *Iſaiah* ix. 6. that relates to the *Meſſias*, where he is ſtiled אֲבִי־עַד, render it πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, *the Father of the World to come.*

Agreeable to which, as well as by Way of Confirmation of what has been ſaid upon this Argument, is that very pertinent Quotation that is made by the learned and indefatigably induſtrious Mr. *Pool* *, out of *Abarbenel*, in theſe Words; *Triplex ſæculum futurum notat Abarbenel*; 1. *Sæculum Meſſiæ.* 2. *Poſt hanc vitam.* 3. *Poſt reſurrectionem mortuorum. De primo locus hic intelligi poteſt, &c.* —— *Abarbenel* obſerves, "That "there is a three-fold World to come; "the Firſt is the Age of the *Meſſias*; "the Second is immediately after this "Life; the Third is after the General "Reſurrection; of the Firſt this Place "may be underſtood."

Add to which, laſtly, That 'twas a common Opinion amongſt the ancient *Jews*, that all Sins would be forgiven them in the Age or Time of the *Meſſias*. In Oppoſition to which, as well as to rectify that miſtaken Notion of theirs, our bleſſed Saviour here tells 'em, That the

* *See* Pool's Synopſis *upon the Place towards the latter End of that Annotation.*

the *Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt*, in particular, ſhould not be forgiven 'em in that Age of the *Meſſias* which they expected to come.

From all which, I think, it appears, that there is Ground enough for the Interpretation given of theſe Words in the Paraphraſe, —— *Whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him in this preſent Age of the* Jewiſh *Diſpenſation, nor in that Age of the Meſſias, which you, deluded* Jews, *vainly expect to come, wherein you hope to have all your Sins forgiven you.*

Before I conclude the whole, if any one ſhould diſapprove the foregoing Expoſition, I would have him remember, that I offer it with Humility (as I do every Thing elſe here ſaid) to the Judgment of the Learned. And I would only ſubjoin a Word or two more concerning the Nature as well as Unpardonableneſs of this Sin; 1*ſt.* As to the Nature of it, wherein it conſiſted, That it was that particular Blaſphemy of the *Phariſees*, whereby they did obſtinately and maliciouſly impute the Miracles that our Saviour wrought by the Power of the Holy Ghoſt to the Devil, is evident from the 3d of St. *Mark*'s Goſpel, the 29th and 30th Verſes, where the Evangeliſt ſpeaking of this particular Sin, has

theſe Words, *But he that ſhall blaſpheme againſt the Holy Ghoſt hath never Forgiveneſs, but is in Danger of eternal Damnation; becauſe they ſaid, He hath an unclean Spirit.* Then, 2*dly*. The Reaſon why this Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt is ſaid to be Unpardonable, is, becauſe no Man that is guilty of it can repent of it; for without Repentance there can be no Remiſſion: And the Reaſon why no Man can repent of it is, becauſe when he has done the utmoſt Deſpite that can be unto the Spirit of Grace, (as the Apoſtle expreſſes it, *Heb.* x. 29.) it is impoſſible without Grace to repent.

Matthew, *Chap.* XVI. *v.* 18.

And I ſay alſo unto thee, that thou art Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church.*

Paraphrase.

—— Upon this Rock which thou haſt confeſſed I will build my Church.

Annotation.

He does not ſay upon Thee, but *upon this Rock I will build my Church*, meaning by that, *Himſelf*; for *that Rock was Chriſt*, 1 *Cor.* x. 4. For although the Words in the Original run thus, Κἀγὼ δὲ

δὲ σοὶ λέγω, ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. It does not at all follow, becauſe he called him *Peter*, that therefore He would build his Church upon him, but upon the Rock which he had confeſſed and acknowledged to be the Chriſt, *v.* 16. *upon this very Rock I will build my Church*, meaning by that *Himſelf*, though at the ſame Time he alludes to the Name of *Peter*.

For if (as the *Romaniſts* argue, and would fain have it) our bleſſed Lord had intended theſe Words in ſuch a Senſe, that He would build his Church upon the Perſon of *Peter*, in all Probability he would have ſaid, ἐπὶ σοὶ οἰκοδομήσω, *upon thee I will build*, &c. —— But ſince 'tis ſo very plain, that he does not ſay ἐπὶ σοὶ οἰκοδομήσω, but ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, *upon this Rock I will build*, &c. meaning or pointing to himſelf, (as he is ſuppoſed by ſome to have done, when he ſaid, *Deſtroy this Temple, and in three Days I will raiſe it up*, John ii. 19.) it is as evident and plain, that he did not deſign it to the Perſon of *Peter*, and conſequently that there is no Ground from hence for that Opinion of the *Romaniſts*.

And to add another very conſiderable Argument againſt it, it is worthy our Obſervation, that at the 23d Verſe of

this Chapter, (where our bleſſed Saviour had ſaid ſuch great Things to St. *Peter* before) he calls him *Satan, But he turned and ſaid unto* Peter, *Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an Offence unto me*, &c. which is a Title one would think that very ill ſuits with the Character of an Apoſtle, much leſs of Him that was to be a Founder of the Chriſtian Church; but which is more ſtrictly applicable to ſome of St. *Peter*'s Succeſſors at *Rome* more than ever it was to himſelf; and conſequently He whom our Saviour called *Satan* could not be that Rock that he would build his Church upon.

But, however, if there are any that ſhould be ſo inquiſitive as to know why our bleſſed Lord ſhould do the Apoſtle St. *Peter* ſo much Honour, (though he mortified him ſufficiently afterwards with the Title of *Satan*) as to make ſuch an Alluſion to his Name, and ſo give Occaſion to ſome weak Perſons to imagine, that He would build his Church upon him, to this the Anſwer is very eaſy; That St. *Peter* was indeed to be the firſt Preacher of the Goſpel, firſt to the *Jews*, *Acts* ii. 14. and then afterwards to the *Gentiles*, *Acts* x. 34. and ſo conſequently in this reſpect he might be

be ſaid to be the firſt Founder of the Chriſtian Church, and for that Reaſon, the very chiefeſt of the Apoſtles. Yet ſtill even that Primacy of his did not infer a Supremacy over the reſt of the Apoſtles; for, after all, the Chriſtian Church was not founded more upon St. *Peter* than it was upon the other Apoſtles, but it was equally founded by Them as well as by Him; for ſo the Apoſtle St. *Paul* plainly intimates in thoſe Words ſo very pertinent to our Purpoſe, where he ſays, *And ye are built upon the Foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief Corner-Stone.* And again, the Apoſtle St. *John*, in the 21ſt of the *Revelations* and the 14th Verſe, *And the Wall of the City had twelve Foundations, and in them the Names of the twelve Apoſtles of the Lamb:* Which if ſo, if the Church of Chriſt was equally founded upon, or rather, by all the Apoſtles alike, by one as well as by another, it evidently follows, that St. *Peter* was not that Rock that our Saviour would build his Church upon, but Himſelf was the Rock, who was alſo the chief Corner-Stone.

Matthew, *Chap.* XVI. *v.* 19.

And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven; and whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven.

PARAPHRASE.

And I will give thee the Power of opening and ſhutting the Kingdom of Heaven, by the Remiſſion of or Retaining Men's Sins, as alſo the Power of letting Men into that heavenly Kingdom by or with the Key of Knowledge and Inſtruction; and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, under the ſevere Penalty or Sentence of an *Apoſtolical Excommunication*, ſhall be bound under the ſame Sentence in Heaven; and whatſoever, or rather whomſoever you ſhall give a Diſcharge to therefrom, ſhall be ſo diſcharged in Heaven.

ANNOTATION.

The giving one the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, is evidently a Metaphorical Expreſſion for inveſting one with the Power of *Opening* and *Shutting* the Kingdom of Heaven. And which Way can that be ſuppoſed to be ſo effectually

fectually done as by the Remiſſion of and Retaining Men's Sins? And becauſe the *Key of Knowledge* (as it is ſo called, *Luke* xi. 52.) is that whereby Men are let into the Kingdom of Heaven, which is it ſelf preparatory towards it, therefore I thought it proper to inſert that Senſe in the Paraphraſe, "The Power of "letting Men into that heavenly King-"dom by or with the Key of Knowledge "and Inſtruction.

And yet this Priviledge of opening and ſhutting the Kingdom of Heaven, that was beſtow'd upon St. *Peter*, was not appropriated to him alone, but it was confer'd likewiſe upon all the other Apoſtles beſides; for thus we read in the 20th of St. *John*'s Goſpel, and the 23d Verſe, where our bleſſed Saviour ſaid expreſly to 'em all, *Whoſe ſoever Sins Ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whoſe ſoever Sins Ye retain, they are retained:* And as to the Key of Knowledge, whereby the aforeſaid Apoſtle was ſuppos'd to inſtruct Mankind, and eſpecially the Converts that he made, and ſo by that Means let 'em into the Kingdom of Heaven, this is what all the other Apoſtles were equally inſtrumental and active in as well as He.

Then as to thoſe other Words *Binding* and *Looſing*, the Power that was given

given to St. *Peter* in and by them, was actually delegated to the reſt of the Apoſtles in the very ſame Terms; for thus we read again in the 18th of St. *Matthew* and the 18th Verſe, *Verily I ſay unto you, whatſoever Ye ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven; and whatſoever Ye ſhall looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven:* Which, whatſoever may be the true Senſe or Meaning of, whether the binding incorrigible Perſons under the ſevere Penalty or Sentence of an Apoſtolical Excommunication, (as we have interpreted already in the Paraphraſe, and as ſome other Expoſitors upon the Place do likewiſe interpret) or whether the inſtituting and enacting ſuch Ordinances, as might be thought proper for the Settlement of the Church, (as others may think) and the abrogating or aboliſhing all the reſt, even the whole Body of the *Moſaic* Law, (as it is well known that the Apoſtles did at their firſt General Council or Meeting, *Acts* xv.) or both; I ſay, which Way ſoever theſe Words may be taken, whatever Power we may imagine was given to St. *Peter*, the ſame was equally veſted in all the Apoſtles.

The main Scope and Drift of all which is, That there is no Ground from hence, not even from this nor the foregoing Verſe, to conclude, that there ever was

was any Supremacy in *Peter* over the reſt of his Fellow-Brethen; ſo far from it, that there is a very ſtrong Argument againſt it in that famous Paſſage of St. *Paul* in the 2d to the *Galatians* and the 11th Verſe, where the Apoſtle expreſſes himſelf thus, *But when* Peter *was come to* Antioch, *I withſtood him to the Face, becauſe he was to be blamed.* What? oppoſe or withſtand the ſupreme Head of the Church! This is a plain Proof therefore, not only of St. *Peter*'s No Supremacy, but of St. *Paul*'s Equality with him; nay, in ſome Senſe, of an abſolute Authority or Superiority over him: And conſequently that thoſe Keys, or that Power that was given to St. *Peter*, was equally communicated to all the Apoſtles.

Matthew, *Chap.* XIX. *v.* 23.

Then ſaid Jeſus unto his Diſciples, Verily I ſay unto you, that a rich Man ſhall hardly enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.

PARAPHRASE.

Verily I ſay unto you, that a rich Man will hardly become a Diſciple of mine, and embrace the Chriſtian Profeſſion, upon Condition of being oblig'd to part with All that he has for my Sake and

and the Goſpel's; and ſo, conſequently, 'twill be with great Difficulty that he will enter into the Kingdom of everlaſting Bliſs and Glory.

ANNOTATION.

That this is the full and true Senſe of theſe Words, may appear from the following Particulars.

1. If we conſider the Occaſion of thoſe Words, which was, (as we may read Verſe the 16th of this Chapter) *And behold one came and ſaid unto him, Good Maſter, what good Thing ſhall I do that I may have eternal Life?* The bleſſed Jeſus tells him, Verſes 17, 18, 19, *That he muſt keep the Commandments*, particularly thoſe Precepts that he mentions to him. To this the young Man replies, Verſe 20. *All theſe Things have I kept from my Youth up; What lack I yet?* What other Qualification is there that I am either deficient in, or that is indiſpenſably requir'd of me? Jeſus ſaid unto him, Verſe 21. *If thou wilt be perfect, go and ſell that thou haſt, and give to the Poor, and thou ſhalt have Treaſure in Heaven, and come and follow me*, Verſe 22. But when the young Man heard that Saying, he went away ſorrowful, for he had great Poſſeſſions. Then, upon his going away ſo ſorrowful, or becauſe he was loth to be

a

a Diſciple and a Follower of the bleſſed Jeſus upon ſuch Conditions; *Then ſaid Jeſus unto his Diſciples, Verily I ſay unto you, that a rich Man ſhall hardly enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*; that is, A rich Man will very hardly be prevailed upon to become a Diſciple of mine upon theſe Terms; and conſequently they that refuſe to do this, 'twill be with the greateſt Difficulty, if not next to an Impoſſibility, that ſuch Perſons will enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. But,

2*dly*, The Kingdom of Heaven ſignifies oftentimes the Kingdom of the *Meſſias*, or the Goſpel Diſpenſation, which is it ſelf preparatory, or that directly leads to Glory; which if ſo, then by entring into the Kingdom of Heaven in this Place, may be meant the entring upon or embracing the Chriſtian Profeſſion; which is abſolutely neceſſary to be done by all Perſons in order to an Entrance into Glory. However, ſuppoſing,

3*dly*, and laſtly, That the Words abſtracted from the Occaſion of 'em do or ſhould import the exceeding great Difficulty of a rich Man's entring into Heaven it ſelf, which from that Compariſon or Similitude of a Camel's paſſing through the Eye of a Needle, is repreſented as a Thing impoſſible; yet this is no more

than what may eaſily be accounted for or explained in that parallel Place of St. *Mark*'s Goſpel, *chap.* x. *v.* 24. where our bleſſed Saviour ſatisfies at once his Diſciples and us, ſaying, *Children, how hard is it for them that truſt in Riches to enter into the Kingdom of God?*

And beſides, that it is not a Thing abſolutely and in its own Nature impoſſible, but only relatively and humanly ſpeaking, or with reſpect to human Power, is evident from thoſe laſt Words of his, *With Men this is unpoſſible, but with God all Things are poſſible.*

A N

EXPOSITION

Of Some of

The moſt difficult Places

I N

St. *MARK*'s Goſpel.

MARK, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 49.

For every one ſhall be ſalted with Fire.

PARAPHRASE.

FOR every one ſhall be ſeaſoned with, as well as undergo, a fiery Trial of one Kind or other, either in this Life or in the next.

ANNOTATION.

This Phraſe of being *ſalted with Fire* is no where elſe to be met with that I

know of in Holy Writ, but only in this Place; and it ſeems either to refer or allude to that particular Precept of the Levitical Law, where it is ſaid, *And every Oblation of thy Meat-Offering ſhalt thou ſeaſon with Salt*, Levit. ii. 13. Now ſince 'tis plain from *Coloſ.* iv. 6. that Salt is an Emblem of Divine Grace, that preſerves our Souls from Corruption, and Fire it ſelf is of a purifying Nature, there ſeems to me to be Ground enough from hence for the Interpretation given of theſe Words, *Every one ſhall be ſalted with Fire*, that is, " Every one ſhall be " ſeaſoned with, as well as undergo, a " fiery Trial of one Kind or other, ei- " ther in this Life or in the next."

Mark, *Chap.* XIII. *v.* 32.

But of that Day and that Hour knoweth no Man, no, not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

PARAPHRASE, none.

ANNOTATION.

I don't ſee what Advantage either the *Arian* or *Socinian* can gain from hence; for if our bleſſed Lord, when he ſpoke theſe Words, did not know the preciſe Time of the Day of Judgment, it does not

not follow but that he might or did know it afterwards; for the Communication of the Divine Perfections to his human Nature ſeems to be gradual, as is plain from *Luke* ii. 52. where it is ſaid, *Jeſus increaſed in Wiſdom and Stature*, &c. which is only to be underſtood of his Humanity, not of his Divinity.

And if the divine Omnipotence it ſelf was not communicated to his human Nature, at leaſt not in ſo ample a Meaſure Before as After his Reſurrection, as it is reaſonable to conclude it was not, from thoſe Words of his, *Matthew* xxviii. 18. *All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth*; Why not the divine Omniſciency likewiſe? Which if ſo, then from his not knowing the particular Time of the Day of Judgment before his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion into Glory, it does not follow but that he might and did know it afterwards, even after his Exaltation to *the Right Hand of the Majeſty on high*.

AN

AN EXPOSITION ON THE First Verse of the First Chapter OF St. *JOHN*'s Gospel.

JOHN, *Chap.* I. *v.* I.

In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

PARAPHRASE.

AT the Beginning of the Creation of all Things, and before the Beginning of all created Beings, the Word was in Being, and the *Word was with God, and the Word was God.*

ANNO-

ANNOTATION.

A late Writer, in his *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*, * has this Obſervation upon this laſt Sentence, *and the Word was God*, by Way of Explication: "Of theſe "Words 'tis evident there are only three "poſſible Interpretations. The firſt is, "That the *Word* was That ſame Perſon "whom he was with; and this is both "a Contradiction in Terms, and alſo "the ancient Hereſy of *Sabellius*. The "ſecond is, that the Word was another "Self-exiſtent, Underived, Independent "Perſon, Co-ordinate to Him with whom "he was; and this is the Impiety of "*Polytheiſm*, ſubverting that Firſt and "Great Foundation of All Religion "both Natural and Reveal'd, the Unity "of God. The third is, that the *Word* "is a Perſon, deriving from the Father "(with whom he exiſted before the "World was) both his Being it ſelf, and "incomprehenſible Power and Know-"ledge, and other divine Attributes "and Authority, in a Manner not re-"vealed, and which human Wiſdom "ought not to preſume to be able to "explain; and this is the Interpreta-"tion of the learnedeſt and moſt anci-"ent

* Dr. Clark, *Part* I. *Chap.* II. *pag.* 86 *of the* 1*ſt Edit.*

" ent Writers in the Primitive Church." So again, in Page 272 of the ſame Book, he has likewiſe theſe Words, " 'Tis ob- " ſervable that St. *John* in that Paſſage, " where he not only ſpeaks of the " Word before his Incarnation, but car- " ries his Account of him farther back " than any other Place in the whole New " Teſtament, gives not the leaſt Hint of " the *Metaphyſical Manner*, how he de- " rived his Being from the Father; " does not ſay He was *created*, or *emit-* " *ted*, or *begotten*, or was an *Emanation* " from him; but only that he *was*, " that he *was* in the Beginning, that he " *was* with God, and that he *was* [θεὸς] " Partaker of divine Power and Glory " with and from the Father before the " World was."

Which in Conjunction with ſome o- ther Paſſages of his, where it is ſaid, both in his own and in other Author's Words, that the Father alone is Self- exiſtent, independent, abſolutely Su- preme over all, God in the higheſt Senſe, by Way of Eminence, and the like, Pages 244, 245, 262, *&c.* do plain- ly intimate or inſinuate thus much to us, that neither the Son nor Holy Spirit are truly and properly God, becauſe they derive their Exiſtence from, are actually ſubordinate to, and dependent on

on the Father; and conſequently, that they are neither of 'em ὁμοούσιος, *of the ſame divine Eſſence or Subſtance with the Father*; for (as he expreſly affirms, *pag.* 465.) "A Perſon who is not Self-exiſtent, "cannot, without a manifeſt Contradi-"ction, be ſaid ſtrictly and properly, "and in the metaphyſical Senſe of the "Phraſe, to be of the ſame Eſſence with "a Perſon who is Self-exiſtent, and of "whoſe Eſſence that Self-exiſtence muſt "of Neceſſity be a principal Character.

IN ANSWER to all which, I would beg Leave both to argue and expoſtulate with that learned Author after the following Manner:

Suppoſe, Sir, it ſhould be granted, that the Father alone is Self-exiſtent, yet how does it follow from thence, that the Son and Holy Spirit are not ὁμοούσιοι, *of the ſame divine Eſſence with the Father*, and conſequently not ſtrictly or properly God, becauſe they derive the divine Eſſence from Him? For (that I may make Uſe of an Illuſtration that is both authorized and allowed by Antiquity, tho' I am very ſenſible that all Illuſtrations are inadequate and inſufficient to repreſent the ever bleſſed Trinity) how does it follow, becauſe a Fountain or Spring-head is diſtinct from either the

Stream or the River that proceeds from it, that therefore the Water that glides along the One is not of the ſame Eſſence or Nature with that that ſprings up in the Other?

'Tis certain, that the two Properties both of the Fountain and of the River do actually differ from each other, becauſe the one is perpetually bubbling up, the other is inceſſantly flowing onward or downward, and yet notwithſtanding the Difference of theſe two Properties, the Eſſence or Nature of Water is the ſame in both; for one is as much Water as the other: So in the Divine Nature (with Reverence be it applied) though the Father himſelf be the Fountain of the Deity, and the Son and Holy Spirit are two derivative Emanations from that Fountain, yet how does it follow that the Two latter may not be ὁμοούσιοι, of the ſame Divine Eſſence or Nature with the Former, when notwithſtanding the Diſtinction of Properties whereby they differ from each other, the Eſſence or Nature may be the ſame in all Three?

The eſſential Property of the Father is, that He is the Fountain; the Properties of the other Two are, that the One is generated from the Father, the Other proceeds both from Father and Son, and yet notwithſtanding the Generation of

of the Second, and the Proceſſion of the Third, notwithſtanding thoſe eſſential Properties whereby each of the Three Perſons differs from the other, the Eſſence is the ſame in all Three; there is but One Eſſence or Subſtance, and yet there are Three Hypoſtaſes in that Divine Eſſence; there is but One *Jehovah*, and yet there are Three *Elohim*, which Three *Elohim* are One *Jehovah*.

And accordingly it ought to be obſerved Not only what *Rabbi Simeon Ben Jochai* in *Zoar*, at the 6th Section of *Leviticus*, ſays, which is peculiarly worthy your Obſervation *, *Veni & vide myſterium verbi Elohim; ſunt tres Gradus, & quilibet gradus per ſe ſolus, i. e. Diſtinctus; veruntamen ſunt Unus, & in unum conjunguntur, nec unus ab altero dividitur.* "Come and ſee the Myſtery of the Word "*Elohim*; there are Three Degrees, and "yet each Degree is Alone by it ſelf, that "is, it is Diſtinct; and yet nevertheleſs "they are One, and are joyned together "in One, and neither is divided from the "Other.' But alſo what the Book entitled *Schep-tal* ſays †, "That סְפִירוֹת *Sephiroth*,

* *See* Pool's Synopſis *upon the* 1*ſt Chapter of* Geneſis *and the* 1*ſt Verſe.* בְּרֵא אֱלֹהִים

† *See* Grotius *de Veritate Chriſtianæ Religionis, Book* 5. *Sect.* 21. *Annotat. Page* 359.

" Number in God does not hinder or is " not inconſiſtent with Unity."

For which Reaſon, *Jehovah Elohim* is oftentimes put together in the Old Teſtament, to ſignify or denote to us a Trinity in Unity as well as Unity in Trinity.

As to the Danger of falling into *Sabellianiſm*, that is an Objection that I ſhall give a direct Anſwer to by and by. In the mean Time, that I may go on with my Deſign, which is to ſap or overturn the very Foundation of your whole Hypotheſis: There are two Arguments of yours that are drawn from the Self-exiſtence and Supremacy of the Father, that you ſeem to lay a mighty Streſs upon, whereon you build the whole Superſtructure of your Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, which I ſhall therefore attack in Form.

I. Your firſt Argument from Self-exiſtence runs thus; There is but One ſelf-exiſtent Being, the Father alone is ſelf-exiſtent; *Ergo*, Since the Son and Holy Spirit are neither of 'em ſelf-exiſtent, for that very Reaſon they are neither of 'em ſtrictly or properly God, becauſe whatever is God muſt be ſelf-exiſtent: The Anſwer to which is as follows, That the Son and Holy Ghoſt are both of 'em Self-exiſtent, as that ſignifies Neceſſarily

ceſſarily exiſtent; for the Divine Eſſence or Nature which they are Partakers of in Joint-union with the Father, is ſo Neceſſarily exiſtent in it ſelf, that it implies an abſolute Contradiction to Non-exiſtence, and thus far, or in this Senſe, they are both of 'em Self-exiſtent, becauſe the whole Eſſence that is common to all Three is Self-exiſtent.

But then there is a Diſtinction that may and ought to be applied, which is, that the Self-exiſtence of the Son and Holy Spirit is only with reſpect to the divine Eſſence that is common to them with the Father, but not with reſpect to their own proper Perſonalities, which may be ſuppos'd to be dependent on and derived from the Father; for whether you will allow it or no, there is certainly a Diſtinction betwixt the Eſſentiality and the Perſonality of the Divine Nature, or, which is all one, between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, Eſſence and Perſon, the Non-obſervation of which has led you into inextricable Confuſion and Error.

And therefore when I ſay that the Son and Holy Spirit are both of 'em Self-exiſtent, this is only to be underſtood in Oppoſition to Non-exiſtence, as well as to any arbitrary Production, but not in Oppoſition to that Dependance that they have upon the Father, becauſe there

there is a Communication of the divine Eſſence from the Father to the Son, and from Father and Son to the Holy Ghoſt; which Communication, tho' in it ſelf neceſſary, yet is entirely agreeable to the Will of the Father.

And although you ſeem to explode the aforeſaid Diſtinction of Eſſence and Perſon by a Citation out of *Athanaſius*, Page 359. of your *Scripture-Doctrine*, yet ſince there is no Argument offer'd of any Weight to diſprove it, I ſhall inſiſt upon it altogether as a very juſt Diſtinction.

But ſuppoſing again once more, (only for Suppoſition ſake) that we ſhould allow you that the Son and Holy Spirit are not Self-exiſtent, becauſe of that Dependance that they may have upon the Father, yet as long as they are eternally Co-exiſtent with the Father, which is what you your ſelf do expreſly confeſs and aſſert, where you ſay, Page 477, "With him always are his Son and his "Spirit, by immediate ineffable Deri- "vation from him, and in intimate U- "nion and Communion with him'; and in Page 479, "With Him (*i. e.* with God "the Father) by immediate Union with "him, and ineffable Communication of "Being and Power from him, are al- "ways his Son and his Spirit." Then

in

in Page 279, Propoſition XV. you ſay, " The Scripture, in declaring the Son's " Derivation from the Father, never " makes Mention of any Limitation of " Time, but always ſuppoſes and affirms " him to have exiſted with the Father " from the Beginning, and before all " Worlds." And again, Propoſition XVI. " They therefore have alſo juſtly been " cenſured, who pretending to be wiſe " above what is written, and intruding " into Things which they have not " ſeen, have preſumed to affirm, (ὅτι ἦν " ὅτε οὐκ ἦν) that there was a Time when " the Son was not." And laſtly, Page 290. Propoſition XX. " The Scripture " (ſpeaking of the Spirit of God) never " mentions any Limitation of Time when " he derived his Being or Eſſence from " the Father, but ſuppoſes him to have " exiſted with the Father from the Be- " ginning.

Which if ſo, if the Son and Holy Ghoſt, by your own Confeſſion and Acknowledgment, were eternally Co-exiſtent with the Father by immediate Union with, and ineffable Communication of Being from him, then they are not only ὁμόσποι of the ſame divine Eſſence, or One God with him, but they are likewiſe ſo far Self-exiſtent, as that implies neceſſary

neceſſary Exiſtence, or an abſolute Contradiction to Non-exiſtence.

But, waving theſe Arguments, that are altogether Speculative and Metaphyſical, I will endeavour to prove the eternal Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghoſt, by ſuch Paſſages out of the New Teſtament as do plainly and neceſſarily imply their having the ſame Divine Eſſence with the Father, and then I will leave it to you to judge, whether or how far they are Self-exiſtent or not, or whether they are not ſtrictly and properly God. And

1*ſt*. As to the eternal Divinity of the Son, (for when once I have eſtabliſh'd that, the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt will eaſily follow) the Texts that I would alledge to this Purpoſe, are 1*ſt*, that which I have been now enlarging upon and arguing with you from, *In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*; The Deduction or Argumentation that I would raiſe from hence being this, If the *Word was with God*, and yet at the ſame Time, the *Word was God*, it evidently follows, that the Word was one God with the Father, that is, of the ſame Divine Eſſence or Subſtance with the Father, though not the ſame Perſon with the Father; for (as I told you before) there

there is a neceſſary Diſtinction betwixt Eſſence and Perſon, there is but one οὐσία, or Eſſence, but three ὑποστάσεις, or Perſons in that Eſſence. And to ſubjoin another very material Obſervation, which I do peculiarly recommend to you upon this Occaſion, He is God *abſolutely* as well as *relatively*, according to a very excellent Diſtinction of the learned Biſhop *Bull*, which you are pleaſed to contradict or deny, *page* 359; for that I may turn your own Argument againſt your ſelf; If (as you obſerve, *page* 272, which is what I cited before) the Apoſtle "gives not the leaſt Hint of the *Meta-*"*phyſical Manner* how he derived his "Being from the Father, does not ſay, "he was *created*, or *emitted*, or *begotten*, "or was an *Emanation* from him, but "only that he *was*, that he *was* in the "Beginning, that he *was* with God, "and that he *was* [θεὸς] God," without any Relation or Manner expreſſed how he was God, it neceſſarily follows that he is God abſolutely as well as relatively, and conſequently one God with the Father, which is *Argumentum ad hominem*, to you at leaſt, by your own implicit Aſſertion or tacit Confeſſion. But,

2. My ſecond Argument or Proof is in the firſt Chapter of the Epiſtle to the

Hebrews, the 8th and 10th Verſes, *But unto the Son he ſaith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* —— *And thou, Lord, in the Beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thy Hands:* From whence I infer, that if the Father gives the Title of God to his own Son, and ſure he would not give him ſo auguſt a Name or Title, unleſs he was in Reality and by Nature God; If the Son *laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of his Hands*, and yet at the ſame Time this very Apoſtle aſſures us in another Place of this Epiſtle, *chap.* iii. *v.* 4. that *He that built all Things is God*, and he can't be ſuppoſed to contradict himſelf; then theſe three Verſes, compared and joined together, do, by a demonſtrative Evidence, prove, that our bleſſed Saviour is actually God in the ſtricteſt Senſe of the Word, and conſequently one God with the Father; for (as he ſaid of himſelf to the *Jews*, and they took him in that Senſe, and for that very Reaſon they *took up Stones to ſtone him*, becauſe *he being a Man made himſelf God*) *I and the Father are One*, John x. 30. that is, One in Eſſence, not in Conſent only.

3. My

3. My third Proof is in the *Revelations, chap.* i. the 11th, 17th, and 18th Verſes, *I am Alpha and Omega, the Firſt and the Laſt*; —— *And when I ſaw him, I fell at his Feet as dead; and he laid his right Hand upon me, ſaying unto me, fear not, I am the Firſt and the Laſt, I am He that liveth and was dead.* —— So again, *chap.* ii. *v.* 8. *And unto the Angel of the Church in* Smyrna *write, Theſe Things ſaith the Firſt and the Laſt, which was dead and is alive:* From whence I argue thus, If our bleſſed Saviour is *Alpha* and *Omega*, if this be a Title that the moſt high God appropriates to himſelf, (as the Evangelical Prophet informs us) *Thus ſaith the Lord the King of* Iſrael, *and his Redeemer the Lord of Hoſts, I am the Firſt, and I am the Laſt, and beſides me there is no God,* Iſaiah xliv. 6; if this very Title that is here attributed to the Father, our bleſſed Lord aſſumes to himſelf; if *He* who is the *Firſt* and the *Laſt*, in the 17th Verſe of the firſt Chapter, and the 8th Verſe of the ſecond, is the very ſame with Him who is *Alpha* and *Omega* in the 11th Verſe of the former Chapter, (as is undeniably evident from Verſes 10, 12, 13, *&c.* that he is, becauſe He is the Perſon whoſe Voice, like the *Voice of a Trumpet*, ſpoke thoſe Words, *Even the Son of Man, who is the Son of God, who*

is God); if nothing higher or greater can be ſaid of the Father than that He is *Alpha* and *Omega*, the Firſt and the Laſt, and this is actually ſaid of the Son, then it evidently and neceſſarily follows, that He is *Alpha* and *Omega* himſelf as well as the Father, and conſequently of the ſame Divine Eſſence or Subſtance with the Father, or One God with Him.

I don't ſee which Way you can evade the Force of this Argument, for though you do allow (*Page* 128. of your *Scripture-Doctrine*) that theſe Titles *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *Firſt* and the *Laſt*, are actually ſaid of and attributed to the Son as well as to the Father, yet you would fain qualify that Conceſſion of yours by a particular Reference to N° 414, where, at the End of your Quotations by Way of Paraphraſe upon thoſe Words, *I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, ſaith the Lord*, &c. *Revelat.* i. 8. you ſeem to intimate, (*Page* 64.) that if our Saviour be *Alpha* and *Omega*, or if he be Παντοκράτωρ *Almighty*, He is ſo only by Donation or Permiſſion, according to Biſhop *Pearſon*, out of whom you cite it, or, according to your own Way of expreſſing it, in a derivative Senſe, dependent on the Father: But ſince it is ſo undeniably evident, that in all thoſe Texts there

is

is no expreſs Mention, nor any the leaſt Intimation of his being ſo derivatively or dependently, (as you and your Followers very whimſically and injudiciouſly ſuggeſt and imagine) and ſince the learned Biſhop *Pearſon* himſelf, when ſpeaking of this particular Text, *I am Alpha and Omega*, &c. ſays *, "In all "theſe Places this Title is attributed "unto Chriſt abſolutely and univerſal-"ly, without any Kind of Reſtriction "or Limitation, without any Aſſigna-"tion of any Particular, in reſpect of "which he is the *Firſt* and *Laſt*; in the "ſame Latitude and Eminence of Ex-"preſſion in which it is or can be attri-"buted to the Supreme God;" (which is directly contrary to the Purpoſe of that other Citation of yours out of him) it follows by a juſt and neceſſary Conſequence that He is actually and in Reality what his Title imports him to be, *Alpha and Omega*, and conſequently of the ſame Divine Eſſence or Subſtance with the Father, (as was ſaid before) or one God with Him.

Before I diſmiſs which Argument, I would beg Leave only to obſerve, that ſince you do acknowledge theſe Texts to

* *See Biſhop* Pearſon *upon the Creed, Article* II. *Page* 124. *in Folio.*

to belong to our Saviour, and they ſtare you ſo full in the Face, 'tis a Wonder to me how you could poſſibly avoid the Conviction that ariſes from hence, and broach your own Opinions that have given ſo much Offence to the World: A Man may ſhut his Eyes and wink againſt the Sun, if he pleaſes, but That is no Argument at all of there being no Brightneſs in that glorious Object, but only of a wilful Obſtinacy or Blindneſs in the Spectator. But to go on,

4. My fourth Proof of the eternal Divinity of the Son of God our Saviour, and conſequently of his being Co-eſſential or Conſubſtantial with the Father, is in the 1ſt Epiſtle General of St. *John*, *chap.* v. *v.* 20. *And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an Underſtanding that we may know him that is true*; *and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt: This is the true God, and eternal Life.* Now from hence I think it very plain, that if Jeſus Chriſt be ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, *the true God*, then he muſt of Neceſſity be of the ſame divine Eſſence or Subſtance with the Father, or One God with Him; for that this is both meant and ſpoken of Chriſt, is evident from his being the immediate Antecedent to which the Pronoun ὅτος refers.

'Tis

'Tis true, indeed, it may be objected, that there are ſome Places in Holy Writ, particularly in the 7th of the *Acts*, and 18th and 19th Verſes, where it is ſaid, *Till another King aroſe, which knew not* Joſeph. *The ſame dealt ſubtilly with our Kindred*, &c.—— Where it muſt be confeſſed, that the Word Ουτος, the ſame in the Original, refers not to *Joſeph*, who is the immediate Antecedent, but to βασιλευς ἕτερος, *another King*, that is the remote Antecedent; and ſo in this Text ſay, or ſomebody elſe may ſay for you, that ὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, *this is the true God*, may refer not to *Jeſus Chriſt* but to God the Father, who is mention'd indeed in the Text, but it is at a very great Diſtance from theſe Words.

The Anſwer to which Objection however is as follows; That a bare Poſſibility of its being ſo, is no Argument that it is ſo; ſo far from that, that ſince God the Father is mentioned only occaſionally and by the bye as it were, not directly in the Nominative Caſe, but obliquely in the Genitive, and that at the Beginning of the Verſe in theſe Words, *The Son of God*, far off from the latter End of it, where it is ſaid, *This is the true God*, &c. ſince *Jeſus Chriſt* is the principal Perſon whom the Apoſtle ſpeaks of in this Verſe, and the Word ἀληθινὸς

is

is actually reſtrained to him, as is evident from theſe Words, καὶ ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, *and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt.* And, laſtly, Since Jeſus Chriſt is the immediate Antecedent to which ὁ ἀληθινος Θεὸς, *the true God*, does refer, I think it ought to be concluded, that this Part of the Verſe οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, *this is the true God*, is actually ſpoken and meant of Chriſt Jeſus, and of none elſe in this Place.

But not to lay the Streſs of the Argument upon what I think only in this Caſe, I have two other Reaſons to offer that mount almoſt to a Demonſtration, and that ought to induce even you to think ſo too; and they are theſe; 1*ſt.* That the Title of *Eternal Life* (which is connected with thoſe Words, ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, *the true God*) is appropriated by St. *John* to the ever bleſſed Jeſus; which if ſo, if in the Language of this Apoſtle, *Eternal Life* is the peculiar Title of our bleſſed Saviour, and This is connected with ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, *the true God*, it evidently follows that he is *the true God, becauſe he is Eternal Life.* And then, 2*dly.* As the incomparable Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* well obſerves, (whom I preſume you pay a great Deference to) when ſpeaking of this

this very Text, that we are now upon, he has theſe Words *, " *This is the true* " *God, and eternal Life*; and then it im- " mediately follows, *Little Children, keep* " *your ſelves from Idols.* What can be " the Meaning of this Caution? And " what is the Connection of it with the " foregoing Diſcourſe? It is plainly " this, That *the Son of God* by his coming " had reſcued Mankind from the ſottiſh " Worſhip of Idols; and therefore he " cautions Chriſtians to take great Heed " of relapſing into Idolatry, by worſhip- " ping a Creature, or the Image and " Likeneſs of any Creature inſtead of " God. And becauſe he foreſaw that " it might be objected to Chriſtians, as " in Fact it was afterwards by the Hea- " thens, That the Worſhip of Chriſt, " who was a Man, was as much Idola- " try as that which the Chriſtians charg- " ed the Heathens withal; therefore " St. *John*, effectually to prevent the " Force of this plauſible Objection, " though he perpetually throughout his " Goſpel declares Chriſt to be really a " Man, yet he expreſly alſo affirms him " to be *God, and the true God*; and con- " ſequently Chriſtians might ſafely pay

* *See Biſhop* Tillotſon's *4th Sermon concerning the Incarnation of our Saviour.*

" Divine Worſhip to Him without Fear
" or Danger of Idolatry; *We are in him*
" *that is true, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt;*
" *This is the true God, and eternal Life;*
" *Little Children, keep your ſelves from*
" *Idols.*"

From all which it is apparent, both from the Title of *Eternal Life*, which is particularly applied or appropriated to our bleſſed Saviour, from the Connection of it with the *true God*, and the Coherence of the 21ſt Verſe with that immediately foregoing, that theſe Words Ἑτός ἔϛιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεος, *this is the true God*, muſt neceſſarily be underſtood of Chriſt, and conſequently that He is himſelf *the true God*, even one God with the Father.

I own indeed after all, that the aforeſaid Objection that I anſwered, is what you had not made your ſelf, but you put a quite different Interpretation upon theſe Words, (*Page* 61. of your *Scripture-Doctrine*, N° 410.) " *This is the true*
" *God and eternal Life: Little Children,*
" *keep your ſelves from Idols.* Some refer
" this to Chriſt, who is immediately be-
" fore mentioned; others, more agree-
" ably to St. *John*'s Style, underſtand it
" of *God the Father*, who is alſo men-
" tioned a little before. But I think the
" truer Interpretation is, that it refers

" to

" to Neither; but that the Meaning is, " *This* (this Knowledge of God in his " Son Jeſus Chriſt) *is the true Religion,* " *and the Way to eternal Life: Beware of* " *Idol-worſhip.*"

Now I appeal to all the World, whether this Interpretation of yours is not a remote and unnatural, a forced and (as I may truly ſay) a *Socinian* Way of expounding Scripture; For what Shadow of an Argument is there that can be brought, why theſe Words ſhould not be taken in a Literal rather than in a Figurative Senſe? Where do you meet with any parallel Place in the New Teſtament, where theſe Words, *the true God*, do ſignify the true Religion? But to ſpeak the plain Truth, (which is obvious at firſt Sight) the true Reaſon of all this is, becauſe the Literal Conſtruction of theſe Words is, that *Jeſus Chriſt* is ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, *the true God*, you were reſolved to evade it by an Interpretation quite wide of the true Senſe of it; which, ſince it is ſo very evident and manifeſt, that thoſe Words ought to be underſtood in the Senſe that we have given of 'em, I think we may very rationally conclude from hence, that our bleſſed Lord is not only *true God*, but of the ſame Divine Eſſence with the Father, or one God with Him.

5. My fifth Proof of his Divinity is in the 6th Verſe of the firſt Chapter to the *Hebrews*, and the 13th Verſe of the fifth of the *Revelations*, which I ſhall join together; the Words of the former being theſe, *And again, when he bringeth in the firſt-begotten into the World, he ſaith, And let all the Angels of God worſhip him:* The Words of the latter are, *And every Creature which is in Heaven, and on the Earth, and under the Earth, and ſuch as are in the Sea, and All that are in them, heard I, ſaying, Bleſſing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power be unto Him that ſitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.* Now the Argument that I would raiſe from hence, even from the firſt of theſe Texts, is, If our bleſſed Saviour is the Object of the Adoration of Angels, and it is certainly as much a Sin in them as it is in us Men to worſhip any Thing that is not God; then it is evident from hence, that He is very God, or one God with the Father.

I am very ſenſible here, that you both can and will elude the Force of this Argument drawn from the foregoing Text, by alledging, That there is a Diſtinction in Worſhip, Supreme and Subordinate, or Superior and Inferior: Abſolutely Supreme Worſhip, you ſay, is only to be paid to the Father; Subordinate

nate and Inferior Worſhip may be paid to the Son: Now this Diſtinction is frivolous, abſurd, and falſe; there is no manner of Ground for it in any Place of Holy Writ; the Scripture makes no Diſtinction at all in religious Worſhip; ſo far from it, that when our bleſſed Saviour himſelf is ſpeaking of the *Father's committing all Judgment unto the Son*, 'tis with this End and Deſign that he does it, *that all Men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*, καθὼς τιμῶσι τὸν πατέρα, *John* v. 23. not with a Similitude only, but an Equality of Divine Worſhip.

But however, that I may ſtop up all Avenues for your making any Retreat, or (if it be poſſible) that I may prevent all Evaſions and Subterfuges whatſoever, I have kept the other Text in Reſerve, which I think muſt and ought to make you yield, if any thing will make you do it at all; for there it is very clear and evident, that the ſame Adoration and Worſhip, the ſame Abſolutely Supreme Worſhip (as you call it) is equally paid to the Son, that is, to the Father; *Bleſſing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power be unto him that ſitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever*; where it is as much to the Son as it is to the Father.

The

The Sum of all which is, that ſince the Son is equally the Object of the Adoration of Men and Angels, as well as the Father, it neceſſarily follows, that He is true God, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ *of the ſame divine Eſſence and Subſtance with the Father*, becauſe no Being that is not ſo, can be equally the Object of Adoration of 'em both: To which I might add,

6. A ſixth and laſt Proof of the true and proper Deity of our Saviour, out of the 9th Chapter to the *Romans* and the 5th Verſe, where he is ſtiled *over all, God bleſſed for ever:* But for this I refer you to my Expoſition of that Chapter, where this is more particularly handled. I might have produc'd many more Texts to the ſame Purpoſe, but for the preſent theſe ſhall ſuffice.

And thus having eſtabliſh'd the Truth of our Saviour's eternal Divinity, and conſequently of his being Co-eſſential or Conſubſtantial with the Father, I ſhall be more brief in my Proofs of the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt: The Texts that I ſhall urge upon this Occaſion being only theſe few out of a great many.

1. In the fifth of the *Acts*, Verſes 3, 4. *But* Peter *ſaid*, Ananias, *why hath Satan filled thine Heart to lie to the Holy Ghoſt, and to keep back part of the Price of*

of the Land? Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? And after it was ſold, was it not in thine own Power? Why haſt thou conceived this Thing in thine Heart? Thou haſt not lied unto Men, but unto God. Where it is very evident that the Holy Ghoſt is God; becauſe *Ananias*, whoſe Heart Satan had fill'd to lie to the Holy Ghoſt in the former Verſe, is actually ſaid to lie unto God in the latter. Then again,

2. In the 1ſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, *chap.* 6. *v.* 19. the Apoſtle argues thus, by Way of Queſtion and Interrogation, *What? Know ye not that your Body is the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?* Which being compared with that other parallel Place in the 3d Chapter of the very ſame Epiſtle, where it is ſaid, *Know ye not that Ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* is a ſufficient Proof not only of the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, but of the Identity of the Divine Nature both in Him and in the Father; for if the Inhabitation of the Holy Ghoſt makes a Temple, (as it is plain that it does) becauſe our Bodies in the former Verſe are ſaid to be his Temple; and if we are likewiſe ſaid in the latter Verſe to be the Temple of God, and

that

that the Spirit of God dwelleth in us, then, ſince 'tis equally clear and evident, that we can't be the Temples of two different Divine Beings, that are wholly diſtinct from each other, but of One only Infinite and Divine Being, who is One indeed in Eſſence, but Three in Perſonality or Subſiſtence, it follows by a juſt and neceſſary Conſequence, that the Holy Ghoſt is ſtrictly and properly God,

3. The third and laſt Place that I ſhall urge in Confirmation of the Two former, ſhall be the Form of Baptiſm it ſelf, *baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, Matth. xxviii. 19. which is it ſelf a ſtrong Proof not only of the Trinity, (if there were no other to be alledged) but of the Holy Ghoſt being Partaker of the ſame divine Eſſence with the Father as well as with the Son; for if we can't be baptized into the Name of any Being or Perſon, who is not really and truly God, if we are likewiſe as much obliged to be baptized into the Name of the Holy Ghoſt, as we are into the Name of the Father and of the Son, it evidently follows, not only that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are a Triune Deity, but that the holy Spirit as well as the Son is One God with the Father,

Father, and conſequently Co-eſſential or Conſubſtantial with Him.

I might produce ſeveral other Places of holy Writ, where the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt is implicitly aſſerted upon the account of thoſe divine Attributes of Omniſcience and Omnipreſence, which altho' incommunicable to any but God, yet are actually and expreſly aſcribed to him, particularly in 1 *Cor. ch.* ii. *v.* 10. where it is ſaid, *the Spirit ſearcheth all Things, yea, the deep Things of God*; and in the 139th *Pſalm*, *v.* 7. *Whither ſhall I go from thy Spirit? Or whither ſhall I flee from thy Preſence?* But waving all Advantages that may be taken from theſe collateral Arguments, I ſhall only inſiſt upon thoſe afore-mentioned for the preſent.

II. Your ſecond Argument, whereon you lay as great a Streſs as you do upon that of Self-exiſtence, is the Supremacy of the Father; you ſeem to take it for granted, that the Father alone is Supreme, excluſive of the Son and Holy Ghoſt from the Supremacy, and therefore according to your Notion, ſince neither the Son nor the Holy Ghoſt is Supreme, they are neither of 'em ſtrictly or properly God. This is your Argument drawn from thence in its full Strength.

The ANSWER to which is as follows, That the Father is indeed Supreme, and yet not ſo as to exclude the Son and Holy Ghoſt from a Joint-Union with him in the Supremacy, for they are all Three the Supreme God; but then there is a Diſtinction in the Supremacy as well as in the Signification of the Word *God*; for if by Supremacy be meant ſuch a Superiority in the Father as to admit no Equal, He is not ſo Supreme, becauſe the Son and Holy Ghoſt are both abſolutely Co-equal, Co-eſſential, Co-eternal with the Father: If by Supremacy be meant an abſolute Power and Authority over the other Two Perſons of the Trinity, the Father is not Supreme in that reſpect neither, becauſe as all the Three Perſons are One in Eſſence, or (which is the ſame Thing) are equally Partakers of the divine Eſſence or Nature, they are for that Reaſon One in Conſent as well as in Eſſence, and conſequently Co-equal in the Supremacy; for a Unity or Identity of Eſſence neceſſarily infers a Unity or Identity of Conſent, as well as an Equality in the Supremacy.

And therefore hence it is that you, I ſuppoſe, as well as other Anti-Trinitarians, would deny the Force of that Text, if it was made Uſe of as an Argument for the Trinity, where it is ſaid,

ſaid, 1 *John* v. 7. *For there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt, and theſe Three are One*; becauſe if the Authority of it was allowed, (which you your ſelf don't ſeem to acknowledge) yet ſtill as they all interpret thoſe Words, *theſe Three are One*, that is, they are One in Conſent only, not in Eſſence; ſo you, I preſume, may be inclinable to the ſame Interpretation or Conſtruction: But to ſpeak the plain Truth, you do not interpret 'em in this Manner; for the Senſe that you put upon 'em (Page 238. of your *Scripture-Doctrine*) is this:

" N° 1248. *For there are Three that* " *bear Record in Heaven; The Father,* " *the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt; and theſe* " *Three are One.*

" Not (Εἷς, *unus*) One and the ſame " Perſon, but (ἕν, *unum*) One and the " ſame Thing, one and the ſame Teſti- " mony."—— Which is the oddeſt or ſtrangeſt Interpretation that ever was put upon theſe Words; to ſay that Three Perſons are One Thing, or that they are one Teſtimony. But, however, ſetting aſide the Impropriety or Abſurdity of it, and to put a favourable Conſtruction upon, as well as to make Senſe of your own Words, we will charitably ſuppoſe for once, that what you do mean

is much the ſame Thing in Effect with what the other *Anti-Trinitarians* do ſuppoſe and imagine, and that is, that they conſent in one and the ſame Teſtimony.

And ſo to return back to the third and laſt Branch of the foregoing Diſtinction (that I have at preſent digreſſed from); If by Supremacy be meant only a Priority in Order, the Father indeed may well be, as he actually is acknowledged by all Chriſtians to be, Supreme in this Senſe; but then this does not infer a Diverſity or Inequality in Nature, but only a Diſtinction and Subordination in Perſonality; for an Equality of Eſſence is by no Means excluſive of or inconſiſtent with a Subordination in Perſonality.

And then again there is a Diſtinction in the Signification of the Word God; God may be conſidered either ἐσιωδῶς Eſſentially, or ὑποστατικῶς Perſonally: In the former Senſe of the Word, God is a complex Term, that ſignifies the Three Terms conjointly; in the latter Senſe of the Word, God is to be taken for any one of the Perſons ſingly.

And now to gather up what has been ſaid into one View, and to apply the foregoing Diſtinctions to the preſent Argument, The Supremacy of the Father may be conſider'd under the Notion either

ther of ſuch a Pre-eminence and Superiority as to admit no Equal, or of an abſolute Power and Authority over the Two other Perſons of the Trinity, or of a Priority in Order only; if under the two former reſpects, the Father is not abſolutely or only Supreme, becauſe the Son and Holy Ghoſt are both Co-equal with Him in Power as well as in Eſſence: If under the latter, then indeed He is Supreme, but yet not ſo as to exclude the Son and Holy Ghoſt from a Joint-union with Him in the Supremacy, for the Supremacy or Supreme Power may be lodged in more than One. And therefore when I ſaid before, that all the Three Perſons in the Trinity are the *Supreme God*, the Word *God* here muſt neceſſarily be underſtood as a complex Term, that ſignifies the Three Perſons conjointly, or a Tri-une Deity.

And thus having ſtated the Notion of the Supremacy of the Father, and ſhewn that neither his Self-exiſtence nor Supremacy do any ways conclude againſt either the Co-eſſentiality or Co-equality of the Son and Holy Ghoſt with the Father, I come now, according to my Promiſe, to anſwer that Objection that may be drawn from the Danger of falling into *Sabellianiſm*, which you often hit us in the Teeth of in your *Scripture-Doctrine of*

the

the Trinity; as if there were no Way of aſſerting a trinal Diſtinction of Perſons in the Divine Eſſence, but Father, Son, and Holy Spirit muſt of Neceſſity be One Perſon, as the *Sabellians* of Old did fondly ſuppoſe or imagine.

The ANSWER to which Objection however, ſince 'tis ſtarted and inſiſted upon by you, is as follows; That ſince 'tis undeniably evident, that the Scripture expreſly mentions *Father*, *Son*, *and Holy Ghoſt*, and ſpeaks of them as we uſe to do of three diſtinct Perſons; ſince the Son and Holy Spirit are not only frequently and expreſly called God, but they have likewiſe the moſt incommunicable Properties and Perfections of the Divine Nature attributed ſeverally to each, it follows with equal Evidence, that although they are Three in Number, they are but One in Eſſence, they are all Three, *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*, One ever bleſſed and undivided Deity; that is, they are undivided as to their Eſſence, but diſtinct as to their Perſonalities, or the Manner of their Subſiſtence.

As to the Poſſibility of conceiving how this can be, that there ſhould be Three diſtinct Perſons, and yet but One God, this is what muſt be owned by all Men

to

to be a very great Difficulty in it ſelf to comprehend or explain; but ſtill this is no Objection againſt the Truth of the Myſtery; for as that aforecited * Prelate obſerves, whom I ſhall mention once again, whoſe Words are ſo very appoſite to our preſent Purpoſe, that one would think they might put a Stop to all Cavils and Objections, whether *Arian*, *Sabellian*, or *Socinian*, which are theſe, "For why ſhould our finite Underſtandings pretend to comprehend that which "is infinite, or to know [Mark the following Words] *ALL THE REAL DIFFERENCES THAT ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE UNITY OF AN INFINITE BEING?*

And to confirm what has hitherto been offer'd upon this particular Argument, there is a Text of Scripture that not only plainly intimates, but that almoſt directly aſſerts, that although they are Three Perſons, yet they are but One God, and although One God, yet ſtill they are Three diſtinct Perſons; 'tis in the 1ſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, *chap.* 12. *v.* 4, 5, 6. *Now there are Diverſities of Gifts, but the ſame Spirit. And there are Differences of Adminiſtrations, but the ſame Lord. And there are Diverſities of Opera-*

* *See Biſhop* Tillotſon's *Sermon upon* 1 Tim. ii. 5. *concerning the Unity of the Divine Nature.*

Operations, but it is the ſame God, which worketh all in all. Now from that Identity here attributed to all the Three Perſons, that is repeated thrice, it is evident that it is One and the ſame Divine Being that is diſtinguiſhed by the different Names or Titles of *Spirit*, *Lord*, and *God*, that both works and diſtributes theſe *Diverſities of Gifts*, *Adminiſtrations*, and *Operations*; for after he had mentioned *Diverſities of Gifts* in the 4th Verſe, which he attributes to the Spirit, and *Differences of Adminiſtrations* in the 5th, which he attributes to the Lord, he adds, *There are Diverſities of Operations, but it is the ſame God which worketh all in all.* Now if *All in All* includes *Gifts* and *Adminiſtrations* as well as *Operations*, (as it is moſt certain that it does, becauſe Particulars are always included in Univerſals) and it is the *ſame God* that does all this, and yet *Spirit* and *Lord* do the ſame likewiſe; it evidently follows, that *Spirit*, *Lord*, and *God*, are One and the ſame Divine Being, diſtinguiſhed into Three Perſons, that are all equally concerned in the Working as well as Diſtribution of theſe *Diverſities of Gifts*, *Adminiſtrations*, and *Operations*: For the Reaſon why the Name of *God* ſeems appropriated to the *Father*, of *Lord* to the *Son*, of *Spirit* to the *Holy Ghoſt*, is only for the Sake of the

the Diſtinction of their Perſons, for although they are diſtinct from each other in Order, Names, and Number, and by their own Perſonal Properties, yet they are all three One ever bleſſed, One undivided Deity. And what is ſtill a farther Confirmation of the Argument, though the Father is God, yet He is likewiſe Lord as well as the Son, and the Son is God as well as the Father; and again, though *He is a Spirit*, John iv. 24. as well as the Holy Ghoſt, yet the Title of *Spirit* is appropriated more to the Third Perſon in the ever bleſſed Trinity than to the Firſt, who is the Father.

From all which it is apparent, that although they are diſtinct from each other by Perſonal Names and Properties, yet they are but One undivided Deity; which if ſo, if theſe Three Perſons are One God, and although One God, are yet Three diſtinct Perſons, if they are Coworkers as well as Joint-Diſtributors of the aforeſaid *Diverſities of Gifts*, *Adminiſtrations*, and *Operations*, (as it is very clear and evident that they are, becauſe in the 11th Verſe of this very Chapter it is ſaid, Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, &c. *But all theſe worketh that One and the ſelf-ſame Spirit*; which is much the ſame with what is ſaid Verſe

the 6th, ὁ δὲ αὐτός ἐστι Θεὸς, ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, *but it is the ſame God which worketh all in all*; and in the 5th of St. *John*, Verſes the 17th and 19th, it is ſaid, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*; ——*for what Things ſoever he doeth, theſe alſo doeth the Son likewiſe*; and in the 2d Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, *chap.* 3. *v.* 17. *Now the Lord is that Spirit.* And, laſtly, it is undeniably evident out, of other Places of Holy Writ, that the Lord Jeſus and the Holy Spirit are One God with the Father.) For all theſe Reaſons together we may well conclude, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, who are diſtinguiſh'd by the different Names or Titles of *Spirit*, *Lord* and *God*, are One and the ſame Divine Being or God, that is, they are the ſame God as to the Divine Eſſence, which they are all equally Partakers of, but diſtinct as to their Perſonalities, or the Manner of their Subſiſtence: For the Trinity (as I humbly conceive) is a trinal Diſtinction of Subſiſtence in the Deity, each of which Diſtinctions is peculiar to each Perſon or Hypoſtaſis in the Divine Eſſence, but incommunicable to either of the Other.

Before I take my Leave of which Argument, I would juſt take Notice of the Interpretation that you are pleaſed to put upon the foregoing Verſes, whereby you

you would ſhuffle off and evade the true Senſe of, or Doctrine contained in, them, which according to my Explanation and Opinion is, that *Spirit*, *Lord*, and *God* are One and the ſame Divine Being, diſtinguiſh'd into Three Perſons, that are all equally concern'd in the Working and Diſtribution of thoſe *Diverſities of Gifts*, *&c*, whereas the Senſe that you put upon 'em, (Page 234 of your *Scripture-Doctrine*) after four ſeveral Quotations out of *Irenæus* and *Athanaſius*, is, " In plainer " Words, the Meaning is, God does all " Things by his Son and by his Spirit." Which is a Propoſition, I believe, that no true Catholick nor *Athanaſian* will ever deny, but which does by no Means contradict the Senſe that I have given of thoſe Words; for although the Father, that is, the Firſt Perſon, does all Things by his Son and Spirit, that are the Two other Perſons, this does not diſprove, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are One and the ſame God as to the Divine Eſſence, tho' not the ſame Perſons with each other: For (as that truly Orthodox Writer and noble Champion for the Truth *Athanaſius*, well expreſſes it in that Quotation that you have made out of him, which is more, I preſume, to my Purpoſe than to yours) Ὅταν δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργῆται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ

Χριστῷ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἀχώριστον ὁρῶ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. *When all Things are wrought or done by God, Through Chriſt, In the Holy Spirit, I ſee the inſeparable,* (or as you render it) *the undivided Operation of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit:* From whence the Inference is very obvious, that if the Operation be inſeparable or undivided, the Eſſence from whence that Operation proceeds muſt be ſo too; and conſequently, though Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are Three diſtinct Perſons, they are but One God, and altho' One God, are Three diſtinct Perſons.

And thus having anſwer'd thoſe two Arguments of yours, that are the two main Pillars of the whole Fabrick of your *Scripture-Doctrine*, and the Objection drawn from *Sabellianiſm*, give me Leave now, towards the Cloſe of all, to expoſtulate the Matter, as well as to argue a little farther with you: What Occaſion or Neceſſity was there for publiſhing your *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity? Quem in finem? Cui bono?* What good End or Purpoſe could you be ſuppoſed to ſerve by it? Was it to ſhew your great Parts and Learning? Or was it out of an Affectation of Singularity, and becauſe you had a Mind to Think

out

out of the common Road? Or was it out of a fatal Neceſſity, as it were, to fulfil a Propheſy of St. *Paul*, where it is ſaid, *There muſt be alſo Hereſies among you, that they which are approved, may be made manifeſt among you*, 1 *Cor.* xi. 19. Or, laſtly, was it for the Diſcovery of as well as propagating the Truth?

If for the laſt of theſe Reaſons, yet ſtill, after all, what is the Diſcovery that you have made, or what is the Truth that you do eſtabliſh? For you allow a Kind of a Trinity that is not a Trinity; you allow the Son and Holy Spirit to be Divine Perſons, that were always exiſtent with the Father, by an immediate Union with, and ineffable Communication of Being and Power from Him, (they are your own Words) and yet you won't acknowledge 'em to be One God with the Father; you ſeem to own likewiſe that they are not created Beings; and if they are not only Uncreated, but eternally Co-exiſtent with the Father, and have an ineffable and immediate Union with, as well as Communication of Being and Power from Him, what can they be but a Tri-une Deity, or Trinity in Unity? So that the Scheme or Doctrine of our Faith is both uniform and conſiſtent with it ſelf, though at the ſame Time it is Myſteri-

ous

ous and Sublime, and not perfectly to be comprehended by mere human Reaſon, but yours is neither the One nor the Other; you may well ſay, indeed, that the Eſſence both of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is *Metaphyſical*, for the Account that you give of them is ſo very Metaphyſical and Abſtruſe, that there is no framing any Notion of 'em from your Explication; for with a Serpent-like Subtilty you wrap up your ſelf within your own Folds, ſo that there's no knowing what you would be at, nor what your Drift or Aim is.

Then within the Compaſs of Two hundred and thirty-nine Pages of the firſt Part of your Book, you have heap'd together a vaſt Collection of Texts, which you would obtrude upon the World with your own Interpretation put upon ſeveral of 'em; and this you are pleaſed to call the *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*, as if your Interpretation was the true *Scripture-Doctrine*; and ſo at the ſame Time whilſt you diſclaim all human Authority and Impoſition upon your own Underſtanding, you plainly uſurp the ſame over others, directly contradicting your own Rule, in the 3d Page of the Introduction to your *Scripture Doctrine*, where it is ſaid, that every Man "muſt of Neceſſity underſtand with "his

" his own Underſtanding, and believe " with his own, not another's Faith."

Then again in the 26th Page of the aforecited *Introduction*, the very ſame Fault that you find or charge upon others, you are actually guilty of your ſelf; for there you are pleaſed to ſay, that " with Regard to Scholaſtick and " Philoſophical Inquiries concerning the " metaphyſical Nature and Subſtance of " each of the Three Perſons in the ever " bleſſed Trinity, this Manner of judg- " ing (that you are there ſpeaking of) " is ſo right and true, that had theſe " Things never been meddled with, and " had Men contented themſelves with " what is plainly revealed in Scripture, " (more than which they can never " certainly know) the Peace of the " Catholick Church, and the Simpli- " city of Chriſtian Faith had poſſibly " never been diſturbed."

Now the Reaſon of your diſturbing the Peace of the Catholick Church, and altering at leaſt, if not corrupting the Simplicity of the Chriſtian Faith, is upon the account of that Philoſophical Diſpute that you your ſelf have raiſed concerning the *metaphyſical Nature or Subſtance of each of the Three Perſons in the ever bleſſed Trinity.*

For

For the true Reaſon why you cannot believe the Son and Holy Spirit to be ὁμοούσιοι, *of the ſame divine Eſſence or Subſtance*, or which is all one, *One God with the Father*, is, becauſe that One of the Three (as you think) can only be Self-exiſtent: The Anſwer that I make to which in this Place (becauſe I have ſaid enough upon this Subject before) is, that not only the Term Self-exiſtent, but the whole Argument founded upon it, is altogether *Scholaſtick* and *Philoſophical*; and conſequently you not only contradict your ſelf in the Rule laid down in your *Introduction*, but in another Aſſertion of yours, (Page 243. of your *Scripture-Doctrine*) where you expreſs your ſelf thus; "All Reaſonings "therefore deduced from their ſuppoſed "metaphyſical Nature, Eſſence, or Sub-"ſtance, inſtead of their Perſonal Cha-"racters, Offices, Powers, and Attributes "delivered in Scripture, are but Philo-"ſophical and probable Hypotheſes." The Drift and Purport of which Obſervation of yours, in Conjunction with that other that was cited a little before, ſeems to me to be, that all our Inquiries into or Diſputes concerning the ſame, ought to be guided entirely by, as well as founded upon holy Writ, or, according to your own Expreſſions, and

as

as you would pretend to have it, they ought to be more *Theological*, and leſs *Philoſophical.*

Which if yours had been altogether thus, or if you had followed that Direction and Caution of the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, and applied it particularly to your own ſelf, *Beware leſt you ſpoil your ſelf through Philoſophy and vain Deceit, after the Tradition of Men, after the Rudiments of the World, and not after Chriſt*, Ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς Θεότητος σωματικῶς, *For in him dwelleth All the Fulneſs of the Godhead bodily*, Coloſſ. *chap.* ii. *v.* 8, 9. you had been more Orthodox in the Faith than at preſent you are.

For indeed, to reſume the Argument once more before I conclude, What is the Reaſon in general why you don't believe the Doctrine of the ever bleſſed Trinity, according to the unanimous Conſent and Opinion of the Catholick Church of Chriſt? The Anſwer to which, if you make any, muſt be, Becauſe you can't reconcile it to your own Reaſon, or you cannot with your own Underſtanding apprehend, or rather comprehend, how it can be. But is this an Argument of any Weight in the preſent Caſe, I would fain know? I appeal even to your ſelf, whom I do willingly

allow to be a Maſter of Reaſon and of human Literature, whether there be any Weight or Force, or even Truth in this Reaſoning, Becauſe you can't conceive how a Thing can be, that therefore it is not ſo? Muſt your Reaſon, Great and Potent as it is, be the Standard or Criterion of the Truth and Certainty of the Articles of our Faith, or, which is all one, of the Senſe and Meaning of Divine Revelation with reſpect to thoſe Articles? I hope you have more Modeſty in you than to ſay that it is; for though your own Reaſon ought indeed to be a Guide to your ſelf, in finding out or judging of the true Senſe of Revelation, yet as long as you are no Oracle in Divinity, nor have any Infallibility in you, it ought not to be ſo to others, not even to your Proſelites and Admirers, at leaſt it ſhan't be ſo to me, who am neither the One nor the Other.

And therefore all that I ſhall think fit to add farther upon the preſent Controverſy (which I hope I have contributed, in ſome Meaſure, towards the Deciſion of) is, that I wiſh there was not too much Occaſion for applying Two Paſſages out of your own Letter to Mr. *Dodwell*, to your ſelf: The firſt is in

in the 93d Page of your Letter in theſe Words: "And now, Sir, I cannot but "earneſtly recommend it again to your "moſt ſerious Conſideration, whether "the new and inconſiderate Notions "you have advanc'd are not likely to "be of great Diſſervice to Religion; "and whether you ought not (as all "good Men are of Opinion you ought) "to think of ſome Means of making "Satisfaction to the Church, to whom "you have given ſo great Offence.

The other is in the very next Paragraph, that is the Concluſion of your Letter, which is as follows, "If Zeal "for the Defence of a Doctrine of ſuch "Importance, has *in any Part of this* "*Letter* cauſed me to drop any Expreſ-"ſions, which may be thought too "ſharp, and to carry in them too little "of that Reſpect which all the World "acknowledges to be juſtly due to you "upon account of your very great "Learning, I know (or I hope at leaſt) "you will pardon it upon ſuch an Oc-"caſion as this; and I cannot doubt "but, upon ſecond Thoughts, you will "be ſomewhat diſſatisfy'd with your "ſelf, for having publiſh'd a Book, at "which all good Men are ſorry, and all "profane Men rejoyce."

For which Reaſon it ſhall be my Prayer for you as well as for my ſelf, *That the God of Truth may enlighten you and me, and every honeſt ſincere Chriſtian, and lead us into all Truth for his Sake, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, even Chriſt Jeſus; To whom, with the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt, Three Perſons but One eternal God, be all Honour and Glory, Adoration, Faith, Love, and Obedience, Praiſe and Thanksgiving, both now and for ever.* Amen.

AN

EXPOSITION

Of Some of

The moſt difficult Places

In the EPISTLE of

St. *Paul* to the *Romans.*

ROMANS, *Chap.* III. *v.* 24.

Being juſtified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt.

PARAPHRASE.

BEING freely forgiven by his Grace and Favour, and ſo accepted or eſteemed as Righteous upon the account of the Remiſſion of our Sins, and of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs being imputed to us; all which

which is conferred upon us in Consideration or by Vertue of the Price of that Redemption that was paid for us by Christ Jesus.

ANNOTATION.

The common Notion of *Justification*, is the being accepted or esteemed as Righteous through the Remission of our Sins, and the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness unto us; for that it consists partly of the Remission of our Sins, is evident by comparing and joyning these two Verses together, *Being justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, to declare his Righteousness for the Remission of Sins that are past, through the Forbearance of God.* Which last Verse seems to be both a Paraphrase upon and an Explanation of that that goes before it; though if it had been translated more according to the Original thus, Ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων, ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *whom God hath set forth a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, for the Declaration of his Righteousness through the Remission of Sins that are past, by the Forbearance of God,* it would

would then have appeared more plainly, that *being juſtified*, in the former Verſe, is equivalent to or of the like Signification with *Righteouſneſs through the Remiſſion of Sins paſt* in the latter; or, however, 'tis ſufficiently evident from theſe Words, that *Juſtification* conſiſts partly of the Remiſſion of our Sins; for (as two eminent Writers of our Church * have judiciouſly obſerved) there is no other Way for ſinful Men, as ſuch, to be juſtified before God, but by abſolving 'em from their Guilt, and ſo accepting 'em as Righteous through the Merits of Chriſt Jeſus.

Then as to the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, though this is exploded by *Pelagians* and *Socinians*, who are pleaſed to ſay, That there is no expreſs Mention of theſe Words throughout the whole New Teſtament, yet ſince 'tis ſtrongly implied in many Places of it, particularly in the 1 *Cor.* i. 30. *Philip.* iii. 9. *Rom.* iv. 24. and it ſeems to me neceſſarily to be ſuppoſed by our Saviour's being a Propitiation for our Sins, (for how can the Perfection of his Righteouſneſs or Obedience be an Atonement for

* *See Biſhop* Blackall's *Sermon upon* James ii. 24. *the Title of which is*, St. *Paul* and St. *James* reconcil'd. *And Mr.* Norris *in his Beatitudes, upon* Bleſſed are they that hunger and thirſt after Righteouſneſs.

for the Imperfection of ours, without the Imputation of it to us in ſome Reſpect or Manner?) I ſee no Reaſon why it mayn't find Admittance and Belief.

Romans, *Chap.* IV. *v.* 5.

But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that juſtifieth the ungodly, his Faith is counted for Righteouſneſs.

Paraphrase.

But to him who does not perform any good Works, whether of the Law of Nature or of the Law of *Moſes*, out of an Opinion of the Merit of either, or who does not perform perfect and unſinning Obedience, (as no mere Man has ever done yet, nor can) whereby he may lay Claim to everlaſting Salvation and Happineſs, but who firmly relies on his Mercy (who both graciouſly forgives the Ungodly, and accepts him as Righteous through the Merits of Chriſt Jeſus) his Faith is counted for Righteouſneſs.

Annotation.

That this is what is meant here by *Not working* in the firſt Place is evident, becauſe the main Scope and Drift of the foregoing Chapter, as well as of this, is to ſhew, that neither the *Jew* nor the

the *Gentile* could be juſtified *by the Deeds of the Law*, for a very good Reaſon aſſign'd by the Apoſtle, *chap.* iii. *v.* 23. *For all have ſinned, and come ſhort of the Glory of God*; and conſequently, if they were juſtified at all, they muſt be by the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt; which if ſo, then ſince neither *Jew* nor *Gentile* could be juſtified *by the Deeds of the Law*, becauſe they both fell ſhort of unſinning Obedience, and were actual Tranſgreſſors of it; and ſince 'tis likewiſe as clear, that the Law, by the Deeds of which the *Gentile* could not be juſtified, muſt be the Law of Nature only, or the Moral Law, as deducible by the Light of Reaſon and Nature, which, in Effect, was the ſame with the Moral Part of the *Moſaic* Law, (though the *Jewiſh* Law as ſuch could not be obligatory to him) it evidently follows, that That is the true Senſe of the Words that we have given in the Paraphraſe, *But to him that worketh not*, that is, " To him who does not " perform any good Works, whether of " the Law of Nature or of the Law " of *Moſes*, out of an Opinion of the " Merit of either, or who does not per- " form perfect and unſinning Obedience, " whereby he may lay Claim to ever- " laſting Salvation and Happineſs."

Then as to thoſe Words, *that juſtifieth the Ungodly*, which I have interpreted thus, " That both graciouſly forgives " the Ungodly, and accepts him as " Righteous through the Merits of Chriſt " Jeſus;" This is apparent from that Notion of *Juſtification* that was laid down before: But, however, that I may prevent all Miſunderſtandings or Miſtakes, when God juſtifies the Ungodly, it is not to be ſuppoſed that He juſtifies him whilſt he continues ſuch, but only when he becomes a true Penitent, and ſo through Faith and Repentance, *Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, which are the Terms of the Goſpel Covenant, he is actually qualified for Divine Pardon and Forgiveneſs, and conſequently in a State of Juſtification with God.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 1, 2.

THE main Scope and Deſign of the Apoſtle throughout this whole Chapter, being to ſhew the Reaſon of the Election of the *Gentiles*, and the Rejection of the *Jews*, which was, becauſe the former embraced the Faith of Chriſt, and the latter did not; he uſhers in what he has to ſay upon this Argument by Way of *Introduction*, with a very ſolemn Aſſertion or Declaration of his own Heavineſs and continual Sorrow of Heart, in the two firſt Verſes of this Chapter, *I ſay the Truth in Chriſt, I lie not, my Conſcience alſo bearing me Witneſs in the Holy Ghoſt, That I have great Heavineſs and continual Sorrow of Heart.*

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 3.

For I could wiſh that my ſelf were accurſed from Chriſt, for my Brethren, my Kinſmen according to the Fleſh.

PARAPHRASE.

For ſuch is the Fervency of my Affection towards, ſuch the Earneſtneſs of

my Deſire for the Welfare and Salvation of the *Jews*, who are *my Brethren*, *my Kinſmen according to the Fleſh*, that if ſuch a Thing would contribute towards or be a Means of promoting it, I could wiſh my ſelf accurſed or ſeparated from Chriſt for their Sakes, not for Eternity, but only for ſo long a Time till all *Iſrael* could be converted and ſaved.

ANNOTATION.

It is not to be ſuppoſed that the Apoſtle could wiſh himſelf damned to all Eternity for the Salvation of the *Jews*; for this is a Contradiction to that natural Principle of Self-preſervation, or that innocent Degree of Self-love that is by no Means inconſiſtent with Charity (for Charity muſt begin at Home) that is implanted in the very beſt of Men; and therefore there is Reaſon enough for the Limitation in the Paraphraſe, "Only "for ſo long a Time till all *Iſrael* could "be converted and ſaved;" for elſe the Wiſh would be altogether Hyperbolical and Impoſſible.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 4.

Who are Iſraelites; *to whom pertaineth the Adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the Service of God, and the Promiſes.*

PARAPHRASE.

Who are *Iſraelites*; To whom pertaineth the Adoption of Sons, whereby they were choſen before all the other Sons of Men, and above all other People upon Earth; who had the Honour of the Divine Majeſty appearing often in the *Shechinah*, as it is ſo called, or Divine Glory; whoſe are the Covenants that were made betwixt God and Man, and the Inſtitution of the *Moſaic* Law, and the Service of God both in the Tabernacle and Temple, and the many gracious Promiſes made to 'em throughout the whole Old Teſtament.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 5.

Whoſe are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the Fleſh Chriſt came, who is over all, God bleſſed for ever. Amen.

PARA-

PARAPHRASE.

Whoſe Progenitors were the Patriarchs, and from whom, as to his own human Nature, Chriſt came by a lineal Deſcent, *who is over all, God bleſſed for ever.*

ANNOTATION.

Here is an expreſs Proof of our Saviour's Divinity, in Oppoſition to all *Arians* Ancient and Modern; and becauſe I referred the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Clarke* to this particular Place, I would take Occaſion to obſerve,

1ſt. That according to his wonted ſly Way, whereby he would evade the Force of any Text that he thinks may be urged againſt him, he inſinuates an ambiguous Conſtruction that may be put upon theſe Words, (*Page* 87. of his *Scripture-Doctrine*, &c.) "The *Greek* Words (ſays he) ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς ——— ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὺς αἰῶνας, Ἀμην, are of ambiguous Conſtruction, and may equally ſignify either, *Of whom Chriſt came, God, who is over all, be bleſſed for ever, Amen*; or, *Of whom Chriſt came, who is over all, God be bleſſed for ever, Amen*; or, *Of whom Chriſt came, who is over all, God bleſſed for ever, Amen.*"

" *men.*" And becauſe he was afraid that if he had inſiſted upon either of the two former Rendrings, that that would have been too obnoxious and liable to Cenſure, he very frankly makes a Conceſſion in the next Page, which although ſeemingly in Favour of the rendring of thoſe Words as they are in our Tranſlation, is by no Means intended by him as any Advantage to the *Argument* it ſelf; for thus he very learnedly and acutely argues and obſerves, (as he thinks) " But the latter of the three " was pitched upon by our Tranſlators, " as the moſt natural and obvious ren- " dring of the Words; and the Senſe is " not difficult. For, as the ſame Apo- " ſtle tells us, 1 *Cor.* xv. 27. that *when* " *he ſaith, All Things are put under Chriſt,* " *it is manifeſt that he is excepted which* " *did put all Things under him*; ſo here " in like Manner, when he repeats the " very ſame Thing, that *Chriſt is God* " *over all*, and *Rom.* x. 12. that he is " *Lord over all*; and *Acts* x. 36. *he is* " *Lord of all*; 'tis manifeſt again, that " He muſt needs be excepted, by Com- " munication of whoſe Divine Power " and Supreme Authority *Chriſt is God*, " or *Lord over all.*" Intimating by all this, that in Strictneſs of Speech, *He is not God over all*, but the Father alone is, becauſe

becauſe 'tis by Vertue of his Divine Power and Supreme Authority communicated to him, that *Chriſt is God*, or *Lord over all.*

The ANSWER that I make to which in the firſt Place is, That the learned Doctor, in the 88th Page of his *Scripture-Doctrine*, contradicts himſelf, if I miſtake not, in the 245th Page; for there he expreſly affirms, "That the Supremacy, which is a perſonal Attribute, "is impoſſible to be communicated from "one Perſon to another"; whereas in the 88th Page he ſays, "That 'tis by "a *Communication of the Father's Divine* "*Power and Supreme Authority, that Chriſt* "*is God or Lord over all.*"

But waving this, (for we ſhan't ſtand with the Doctor for a ſmall Contradiction) our Saviour *Chriſt is over all God bleſſed for ever* in the ſtrict and proper Senſe of the Words; becauſe He is One God with the Father, not the ſame Perſon with the Father, but the ſame God with reſpect to the Divine Eſſence, which he partakes of in common with the Father; for there are Three Perſons, and yet but One God: And as to any ſuppoſed Superiority or Supremacy in the firſt Perſon of the ever bleſſed Trinity over the other Two (as the Doctor is mighty

mighty inclinable to think there is) he is under a very great Miſtake; for they are all Three Co-equal with each other; they are all Three the Supreme God; only there is a Priority of Order amongſt the Three, which Priority of Order is by no Means excluſive of an Equality in the Supremacy; (as has been evidently ſhewn * before) And therefore the bleſſed Jeſus is ſtrictly and truly *God over all*, becauſe He is One God with the Father. In Confirmation of all which, I would take Occaſion to obſerve in the next Place,

2. That the learned and incomparable Biſhop *Pearſon* † has not only enforc'd the Argument drawn from this very Text beyond all Contradiction or Denial, but he has likewiſe anſwer'd thoſe Objections that might ſeem to be raiſed againſt it out of St. *Cyprian* and *Chryſoſtom*.

And the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Mills*, in his Edition of the New Teſtament, and his Annotation upon this Place, has aſſerted the Truth of our Saviour's Divinity, by fixing the Senſe and

* *See Pages* 60, 61.

† *See Biſhop* Pearſon's *Expoſition of the Creed, Article* II. *(where this Text is particularly handled) with the Annotations upon it, Pages* 132, 133. *in Folio.*

vindicating the Authority of this particular Text in theſe Words: "*Lectionem* * *hanc præferunt Codices Manuſcripti omnes*; *Verſiones Vulgata, Syriaca, Arabica, Æthiopica, etiam Coptica, et Armena*; *Patres item Græci & Latini per omne Sæculum, tam Ante-Nicæni quàm qui poſt Arium floruere*, &c. "This Reading is in all "the Manuſcript Copies; the *Vulgar*, "*Syriac*, *Arabic*, *Æthiopic*, and even *Coptic* "and *Armenian* Verſions have it like-"wiſe; as alſo the *Greek* and *Latin* Fa-"thers in every Age, as well *Ante-Nicene*, "as thoſe that flouriſh'd after *Arius*;" which if ſo, if that be the true Reading in the Original, and this the genuine Senſe of theſe Words in the Tranſlation, that *Chriſt is over all, God bleſſed for ever*, then it follows, with undeniable Evidence, that He is the Supreme God; becauſe he is One God with the Father, and conſequently that Dr. *Clarke*'s whole Hypotheſis, with relation to our Saviour's Divinity, is utterly and entirely falſe.

---

* *See Dr.* Mills *upon the Place, Page* 442.

Romans,

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 6.

Not as though the Word of God hath taken none Effect; for they are not all Iſrael *which are of* Iſrael.

PARAPHRASE.

Not as though the Word of God hath failed, either of the Truth of its Prediction or the Performance of its Promiſe; for they are not all true *Iſraelites* that are deſcended from *Iſrael.*

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 7.

Neither becauſe they are the Seed of Abraham *are they all Children; but in* Iſaac *ſhall thy Seed be called.*

PARAPHRASE.

Neither becauſe they are the Offſpring of *Abraham*, are they all Children or Co-heirs; (for *Abraham* had a Son by *Hagar* as well as by *Sarah*; but he being a Son of the Bond-Woman, which is the former, was excluded from being Heir with him who was the Son of the Free-Woman, which is the latter; and he had Sons likewiſe by *Ke-*

turah) but in *Iſaac* ſhall thy Seed be called.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 8.

That is, they which are the Children of the Fleſh, theſe are not the Children of God; but the Children of the Promiſe are counted for the Seed.

PARAPHRASE.

That is, they which are merely the carnal Sons of *Abraham*, theſe are not the Children of God; but the Spiritual Sons of *Abraham*, which are the Children of the Promiſe, theſe are counted for the Seed.

ANNOTATION.

Who theſe Spiritual Sons of *Abraham* are, we may learn in the 3d of the *Galatians* and the 26th and 29th Verſes. *For ye are all the Children of God by Faith in Chriſt Jeſus. And if ye be Chriſt's, then are ye* Abraham's *Seed, and Heirs according to the Promiſe.*

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 9, 10.

For this is the Word of Promiſe, At this Time will I come, and Sarah *ſhall have a Son.*

And not only this, but when Rebecca *alſo had conceived by one, even by our Father* Iſaac.

PARAPHRASE, none.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 11.

(For the Children being not yet born, neither having done any Good or Evil, that the Purpoſe of God according to Election might ſtand, not of Works, but of him that calleth.)

PARAPHRASE.

—— That the Purpoſe of God, which was that He would elect all thoſe that believe in *Jeſus Chriſt*, and reject all thoſe that did not, might be ratify'd and unalterable, and conſequently that the Election of the former ſhould by no Means depend upon thoſe *Works of Righteouſneſs* (as the Apoſtle calls 'em, *Titus* iii. 5.) which they had done before, whether Moral or Ceremonial, but upon the Grace and Favour of Him that called

called them, *through Faith in Chriſt Jeſus*, and upon their obeying that Call, or embracing that Faith.

ANNOTATION.

The Scripture-Notion of Election in general ſeems to be this, They that believe in *Chriſt Jeſus*, ſo as to embrace his Doctrine, to obey his Precepts, to truſt to his Merits, to live in Conformity to his Example, They are properly the *Elect*; they that do not believe in Him in that Manner as is afore-deſcribed, thoſe are Reprobate.

The Works that the Apoſtle ſays the Election of any Perſon does not ſtand, or is not founded upon, and which he is ſuppoſed to mean in this Place, are the Works of the *Moſaic* Law: For the principal Diſpute that the Apoſtle has in this Chapter is with the *Jews*, tho' the *Gentiles*, perhaps, may not be excluded; which if they are not, then by Works may be meant either ſuch as are wrought by the Law of Nature, (which is only or merely Moral) or by the Law of *Moſes*, which is both Moral and Ceremonial. But which Way ſoever it be underſtood, the Reaſon why the Election of all Perſons at the Time of the Promulgation of the Goſpel did not ſtand, or was not founded upon thoſe Works,

Works, was, becauſe it depended wholly upon the Grace and Favour of Him that called them *through Faith in Chriſt Jeſus*, and upon their embracing that Faith.

And this is what I take to be a very material Obſervation, as well as neceſſary Diſtinction, that ought to be inſerted in this Place; becauſe altho' Works before the Publication of the Goſpel-Covenant, were neither the Condition nor the Cauſe of any one's being elected or taken into Favour by God, yet after the Publication of it, thoſe good Works that are either the Fruits of, or that proceed from a Principle of Faith in Chriſt, are now an indiſpenſable Condition of our attaining to eternal Salvation through the Merits of *Chriſt Jeſus*.

And therefore when it is ſaid, That *the Purpoſe of God according to Election might ſtand, not of Works, but of him that calleth*, Election in this Place ſeems principally to relate to thoſe Perſons, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that the Terms of the Goſpel-Covenant were firſt offer'd to, and accepted by them; or if not, if it extends likewiſe to all other Perſons in general that become Converts in future Ages, their Election does not depend upon any good Works that they had done before, (as indeed no Body's does) but

but upon the Grace and Favour of Him that calleth them in and through *Chriſt*, and upon their obeying that Call; and the Inſufficiency of Works before Faith in Chriſt, is by no Means excluſive of the Neceſſity of good Works after the Faith of Chriſt is embraced.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 12.

It was ſaid unto her, the elder ſhall ſerve the younger.

PARAPHRASE.

The unbelieving *Jews*, that are the Elder, who were once the Favourite-People of God, ſhall be rejected and poſtpon'd, to make Way for the believing Chriſtians that are the Younger.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 13.

As it is written, Jacob *have I loved, but* Eſau *have I hated.*

PARAPHRASE.

——— The Poſterity of *Jacob*, who was the Younger, have I loved more than the Poſterity of *Eſau*, who was the Elder.

ANNO-

ANNOTATION.

That this is the Conſtruction that ought to be put upon theſe Words, is evident for the following Reaſons.

1*ſt.* Becauſe theſe Words, when ſpoken by the Prophet *Malachi*, were ſpoken ſome Hundreds of Years after the Birth and Death of each of thoſe two Perſons, and conſequently at that Time when they were uttered by the Prophet, they could not be ſuppoſed to be underſtood of the Perſons of either of 'em, becauſe they were deceaſed long before that; not but that it is poſſible, that this might be literally true, that God had a greater Regard to the Perſon of *Jacob* than *Eſau*, when they were alive, or even before as well as after their Birth; but it is not *ſo* to be underſtood in this Place.

2*dly*, The Prophet *Malachy* himſelf determines, or rather limits theſe Words to this particular Senſe, *chap.* i. *v.* 3, 4, 5. And then,

3*dly*, and laſtly, That the *Interpretation* of theſe Words is *National*, and not Perſonal, is evident beyond all Contradiction or Denial, from *Geneſis* xxv. *v.* 22, 23. where, when *Rebecca* went to inquire

of the Lord about the Children ſtrugling within her; *the Lord ſaid unto her, Two Nations are in thy Womb, and two Manner of People ſhall be ſeparated from thy Bowels.* ——From all which I think it may fairly be concluded, that the *loving* Jacob *and hating* Eſau, as it is here applied by the Apoſtle, is meant with reſpect to the Poſterity, as much at leaſt, if not more than to the Perſons of each of 'em; becauſe ſeveral of the Poſterity, as well as Perſon of the former, were Types or Repreſentatives of true Believers, and the latter of Unbelievers.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 14.

What ſhall we ſay then? Is there Unrighteouſneſs with God? God forbid.

Paraphrase.

What ſhall we infer from hence therefore, that God is either Partial or Unjuſt? Or if He ſhould give the Preference to One above the Other, that He does it without ſome good Grounds or Reaſons for it, beſt known to himſelf, or that He is guilty of Injuſtice in ſo doing? God forbid.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 15.

For He ſaith to Moſes, *I will have Mercy on whom I will have Mercy, and I will have Compaſſion on whom I will have Compaſſion.*

PARAPHRASE.

I will ſhew Mercy to whom I pleaſe, to believing *Gentiles* as well as to the *Jews*; and to *thoſe* rather than unto *theſe*, becauſe the former embrace the Faith of Chriſt, whereas all the latter do not.

ANNOTATION.

The Reaſon of which is from hence, The *Jews* had a Notion that God Almighty was ſo far tied and bound up by the Covenant that He had made with them, and which he had ratified in ſo ſolemn and ſignal a Manner, that whoever was ſaved, they thought muſt of Neceſſity be ſaved by the Works of the *Moſaic* Law; in Oppoſition to which the Apoſtle introduces the Divine Lawgiver himſelf, ſaying, *I will have Mercy on whom I will have Mercy, and I will have Compaſſion on whom I will have Compaſſion*; that is, I will ſhew Mercy and

Compaſſion to whom I pleaſe, notwithſtanding the Covenant that I have made with you, even to all thoſe that embrace the Faith of Chriſt, whether they be *Jews* or *Gentiles*: This ſeems to me to be the direct Import of theſe Words, as they are applied here and intended by the Apoſtle.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 16.

So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that ſheweth Mercy.

PARAPHRASE.

So then it is not of the *Jew* that will be ſaved in his own Way, or that will run his own Courſe in the Works of the *Moſaic* Law, but 'tis of God that ſheweth Mercy in or through the Merits of Chriſt Jeſus, and by Faith in Him.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 17.

For the Scripture ſaith unto Pharaoh, *even for this ſame Purpoſe have I raiſed thee up, that I might ſhew my Power in thee, and that my Name might be declared throughout all the Earth.*

PARA-

PARAPHRASE.

For this ſame Purpoſe have I raiſed thee up, that I might ſhew my Power in thee, in hardening thy Heart after thou hadſt hardened it thy ſelf, in inflicting ſo many dreadful Judgments upon thee and upon thy People, and yet in preſerving thee alive amidſt ſuch a Number or Multitude of Plagues, and in reſerving thee for that laſt Judgment or Overthrow whereby I ſhall deſtroy thee and all thy Hoſt that go in with thee into the *Red-Sea*; all which I both have and ſhall do for the Manifeſtation of my own Power, and Juſtice, and Glory; and *that my Name might be declared throughout all the Earth.*

ANNOTATION.

The rigid *Predeſtinarian* muſt not infer from hence, becauſe it is ſaid expreſly, that *God raiſed him up on Purpoſe that he might ſhew his Power in him*, that therefore his Scheme or Doctrine of abſolute Reprobation is really true; For the Puniſhment of *Pharaoh* was only meant with reſpect to this World, and not in That that was to come. And my Reaſons for confining it to this World are theſe that follow, which I entirely ſubmit to Judgment.

1*ſt*,

1*ſt.* Becauſe it is ſaid in the latter Part of the Verſe, *That my Name might be declared throughout all the Earth*, not through Hell, or another World, but only *throughout all the Earth.* For the particular Inſtances wherein God ſhewed his Power upon *Pharaoh*, and for which *He raiſed him up, on Purpoſe to ſhew his Power in him*, were only thoſe ſupernatural and miraculous Judgments or Puniſhments that were inflicted on him and on his People, (whereby he was ſo far hardened, that he would neither yield to the Divine Juſtice, nor ſubmit to the Divine Will, to *let the Children of* Iſrael *go*) and eſpecially that laſt Judgment or Overthrow, whereby He and all his Hoſt were deſtroyed or drowned in the *Red Sea*; but as to any Puniſhment in a future State, that the Text is wholly ſilent of.

'Tis true, you'll ſay, the Text is wholly ſilent about that, but is not One a neceſſary Conſequence of the Other? To which again I anſwer, That we are not to argue from Conſequences, neither are we to ſtretch thoſe Words beyond the literal or primary Senſe and Meaning of 'em, which was only with relation to this World, for the *Declaration of God's Name throughout all the Earth*; but if this Reaſon ſhould not be allowed

allowed to have any Weight or Force in it, it is to be hoped the

2. Second will, and that is, If you ſuppoſe God to be ſo very Arbitrary and Unmerciful, as to harden *Pharaoh* in this World on purpoſe to Damn him for ever in the next, in ſo doing you not only make God the Author of Sin, which is inconſiſtent with his Holineſs, but you likewiſe make him guilty of the higheſt Injuſtice, Implacableneſs, Severity, or Cruelty, which is inconſiſtent with his Goodneſs.

I am very ſenſible it may be replied here, in Vindication of the Divine Juſtice, that 'tis ſaid of *Pharaoh*, *Exodus* viii. 15. that *he hardened his own Heart*, as well as God hardened it, and therefore he deſerved thoſe Judgments that were inflicted on him. But this can be of no Service to the rigid *Predeſtinarian*, becauſe he ſuppoſes that Original Hardneſs of Heart, (whereby they that are Reprobates, according to his Senſe, are more ſtrongly inclined to Sin than others) to be the Effect of God's ſovereign Will and Pleaſure, without any Regard had to any Demerits of their own; which is ſuch a Suppoſition as is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the Notions that we ought to have of the Divine Juſtice

Juſtice as well as of the Divine Goodneſs. And therefore,

3. My third and laſt Reaſon for putting the aforeſaid Interpretation upon thoſe Words is, becauſe the Threatnings as well as Promiſes of the Old Teſtament don't always extend to a future State; they are moſtly temporal Threatnings, that relate only to this Life. And therefore, ſince 'tis ſo very evident, that the Text limits *Pharaoh*'s Puniſhment to this World, and makes no manner of Mention, nor gives us the leaſt Intimation of his being puniſh'd in another State, (though it is very poſſible he may) I know no Reaſon why we ſhould extend it farther than the Letter of the Text will carry it.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 18.

Therefore hath he Mercy on whom he will have Mercy, and whom he will, he hardeneth.

PARAPHRASE.

Therefore hath He the Prerogative to ſhew Mercy to whom He pleaſes, to the *Gentiles* as well as to the *Jews* if they do but believe in Chriſt Jeſus, and to harden all thoſe that are unbelieving.

ANNO-

ANNOTATION.

This *Hardening* is only meant with reſpect to, and deſign'd as a Puniſhment upon thoſe that would not embrace the Faith of Chriſt; as the obſtinate and unbelieving *Jews* would not, and for that Reaſon they were harden'd.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 19.

Thou wilt ſay then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath reſiſted his Will?

PARAPHRASE and ANNOTATION none.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 20.

Nay but, O Man, who art thou that replieſt againſt God? Shall the Thing formed ſay to him that formed it, Why haſt thou made me thus?

PARAPHRASE.

Nay but, O Man, who art thou that pretendeſt to diſpute againſt the Divine Prerogative or Sovereign Will and Plea-

ſure of the Almighty? For if it be his Will that they that are unbelieving ſhall be hardened, what haſt thou to object againſt it? Shall the Thing, *HARDENED THROUGH ITS OWN FAULT*, ſay to him that hardened it, why haſt thou made me thus Obdurate, and ſo formed me for Deſtruction?

ANNOTATION.

I think this ought to be laid down as a Propoſition of indiſputable Truth, that God Almighty never created any Man with a Deſign to put him under a Neceſſity of being a Sinner here, and, as a Conſequence of that, of being eternally miſerable hereafter; for that is utterly inconſiſtent with the Divine Holineſs, Mercy, and Goodneſs, and even with the Divine Sovereignty, that always acts in Concert with his Goodneſs.

And becauſe the Apoſtle had mention'd *hardening* juſt a little before, and it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe that none are ever hardened but for ſome Demerit of theirs, whereby they deſerve to be hardened; for theſe two Reaſons I thought it proper to expound thoſe Words in the Paraphraſe after this Manner; *Shall the Thing hardened* THROUGH

ITS

ITS OWN FAULT ſay to him that hardened it, Why haſt thou made me thus Obdurate, and ſo formed me for Deſtruction? For that the Formation of any merely rational Creature to Deſtruction, nay even of thoſe that are under the Guidance of Divine Revelation, is only Conditional, is evident from the 18th Chapter of *Jeremiah*, where this Metaphor of Clay in the Hand of the Potter (to which the Text plainly alludes) is ſufficiently explained; for after the Prophet had been at the Potter's Houſe by an expreſs Command of God, and he had obſerv'd a Veſſel made of Clay, marred in the Hand of the Potter, *The Word of the Lord came to him, ſaying, O Houſe of* Iſrael, *cannot I do with you as this Potter, ſaith the Lord? Behold as the Clay is in the Potter's Hand, ſo are ye in mine Hand, O Houſe of* Iſrael. *At what Inſtant I ſhall ſpeak concerning a Nation, and concerning a Kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to deſtroy it. If that Nation againſt whom I have pronounced, turn from their Evil, I will repent of the Evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what Inſtant I ſhall ſpeak concerning a Nation, and concerning a Kingdom to build and to plant it; If it do Evil in my Sight, that it obey not my Voice, then I will re-*

pent of the Good wherewith I ſaid I would benefit them, Jerem. xviii. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 Verſes.

From all which it appears, that the Formation of any one or more Men to Deſtruction, is only upon Condition, or upon the Suppoſition that they do not repent or turn from the Evil of their Ways, or that they involve themſelves in Guilt; if ſo, then they will be prepared or formed for Deſtruction: So that the Formation here ſpoken of, is not to be underſtood, as if any Man was created with ſuch a Deſign antecedently to any Demerit of his, but 'tis ſuch a Formation for Puniſhment as is ſubſequent to his Creation, and is only Conditional. For, that I may reſume the Metaphor once more by Way of *Argument* as well as *Illuſtration*, The Clay is actually in Being antecedently to the Introduction of any one Form, and capable of many Forms.

And now to apply all this, both to the *Text* and to the *Paraphraſe*, Whoever was either hardened or even formed for Deſtruction, according to the Apoſtle's Intention or Meaning in this Place, was only ſo hardened or formed for not embracing the Faith of Chriſt, (for this was the Occaſion of his ſpeaking

ing after this Manner) and not, as the rigid *Predeſtinarian* may imagine, by any original Hardneſs, antecedent to any Demerit of theirs, whereby they ſhould fatally, irreſiſtibly, and inevitably be inclined to Sin; for That is directly to make God the Author of Sin, which it is even Blaſphemy to ſuppoſe, as well as to aſſert.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 21.

Hath not the Potter Power over the Clay, of the ſame Lump to make one Veſſel unto Honour, and another unto Diſhonour?

PARAPHRASE.

Hath not God, the Divine Potter, Power over the Clay of the ſame Maſs or Lump, when all are concluded under Sin, to elect thoſe into his Grace or Favour that believe in Jeſus Chriſt, and to reject thoſe that are Unbelieving, and ſo to make the former Inſtruments of the Divine Glory in this World as well as in the next, and the latter not?

ANNO-

ANNOTATION.

The primary Senſe of the Word *Veſſel unto Honour or unto Diſhonour*, is a Veſſel either to an honourable or diſhonourable Uſe; and, conſequently, as it is applied to Believers and Unbelievers in a Figurative or Metaphorical Senſe, it ſignifies the being Inſtruments or not Inſtruments of the Divine Power and Glory here as well as hereafter; as the primitive Chriſtians or Believers were in a very ſignal Manner, when they were inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, and were indued with a Power of working Miracles, whereby they manifeſted forth the Divine Glory; whereas the latter, the unbelieving *Jews*, were not, but were hardened in their Infidelity, and (as the Apoſtle expreſſes it, 2 *Tim.* iii. 8.) were *reprobate concerning the Faith.*

The foregoing Explication of the Words *Veſſel unto Honour or unto Diſhonour*, is ſufficiently juſtified from or grounded upon that Paſſage of the Apoſtle in 2 *Tim.* ii. 20, which ſeems parallel almoſt to theſe Words, *But in a great Houſe there are not only Veſſels of Gold,*

Gold, and of Silver, but alſo of Wood, and of Earth; and ſome to Honour, and ſome to Diſhonour; where it is plain, that the Veſſels here ſpoken of are either to honourable or diſhonourable Uſes; and conſequently, as applied to Believers or Unbelievers, they ſignify the being Inſtruments or not Inſtruments of the Divine Glory.

Beſides, that the Doctrine of abſolute Reprobation can't be deduc'd from the Text expounded, is clear and evident from the 21ſt Verſe of the 2d Chapter of the aforcited Epiſtle to *Timothy*, *If a Man therefore purge himſelf from theſe, he ſhall be a Veſſel unto Honour, ſanctified and meet for the Maſter's Uſe, and prepared unto every good Work*; which ſufficiently intimates to us, that 'tis partly in a Man's own Power, with the Divine Aſſiſtance, to make himſelf a *Veſſel unto Honour*.

Which if ſo, then it neceſſarily follows, that no Man is predeſtinated to be a Veſſel of Diſhonour in the *Calviniſtick* Senſe, that is, to be under a fatal Neceſſity of committing Sin here, and of being Miſerable for ever hereafter; which is ſuch an Opinion as is perfectly

perfectly ſhocking to all human Underſtanding, and is directly contrary to Revelation as well as to Reaſon.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 22.

What if God, willing to ſhew his Wrath, and to make his Power known, endured with much long ſuffering the Veſſels of Wrath fitted to Deſtruction:

Paraphrase.

What if God, willing to ſhew at once his Anger and his Power, bore with the obſtinate *Jews* ſo long, till they were ripe for Vengeance; and ſo he cut 'em off from being his choſen People, as they had been for many Ages before, and took away both their Place and Nation, in the utter Deſtruction of their City, and the Diſſolution of their whole Polity, Civil as well as Eccleſiaſtical.

Anno-

ANNOTATION.

That this is what is here meant by *Veſſels of Wrath fitted to Deſtruction*, is evident from thoſe Places of the New Teſtament where it is ſaid, that *Wrath is come upon them to the uttermoſt*, 1 Theſ. ii. 16. *For theſe be the Days of Vengeance, that all Things which are written may be fulfilled*, Luke xxi. 22. For the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* was to the unbelieving *Jews* what the Drowning of *Pharaoh* and the *Egyptians* in the *Red Sea* was to them, that is, Judgments upon 'em both for their Obſtinacy, Impiety, and Infidelity. Hence it is that the unbelieving *Jews* are called *Veſſels of Wrath* in this Chapter, becauſe of thoſe dreadful Puniſhments that were inflicted on 'em in this World in the Deſtruction of their City, the Diſſolution of their whole Polity, and in their being Monuments of the Divine Vengeance ever ſince over the Face of the whole Earth.

For if any one ſhould infer from hence, that their being *Veſſels of Wrath* implies their being in a State of eternal Damnation, this is what may eaſily be diſprov'd from thoſe Words of St. *Paul*

in this very Epiſtle, where ſpeaking of theſe unbelieving *Jews*, (whom he calls *Veſſels of Wrath* in this Chapter, and who, as he informs us, *chap.* xi. were *broken off from their own Olive-tree, that the* Gentiles *might be grafted in.*) tells us, Verſe the 32d of that Chapter, *That God hath concluded them all in Unbelief, that he might have Mercy upon all*; conſequently, their being *Veſſels of Wrath* in this Place, does not ſignify their being eternally puniſh'd in another World, but primarily, or principally, their being puniſh'd in a very terrible and exemplary Manner in this, as has been before deſcrib'd.

Romans, *Chap.* IX. *v.* 23.

And that he might make known the Riches of his Glory on the Veſſels of Mercy, which he had afore prepared unto Glory?

Paraphrase.

And that he might make known the Riches of his Grace and Goodneſs, not only in the miraculous Deliverance of, but in many ſignal Bleſſings conferred upon the primitive Believers, whom he had

had determined beforehand, (becauſe he foreſaw that they would embrace the Faith of *Chriſt*) to be Inſtruments of his Glory here, as well as to be Partakers of his infinite Mercy and Goodneſs, in the Enjoyment of eternal Bliſs and Glory hereafter.

Tri-uno Deo Gloria.